The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CIX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1919 No. 2832

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 485

EDITORIALS:

Mr. Gary Moralizes 488
Our Hatred of England 489
The New Geography of the Sea 490
Omaha 491
Adelina Patti 491

GOING BACK—AND WHY. By George Seibel 492

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY IN AMERICA. By Alice Edgerton 494

IS THERE BOLSHEVISM IN YUCATAN? By Manuel Carpio 496

PASTURAGE. By Marie Emilie Gilchrist 498

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:

The Menace of Revolution. By Herbert W. Horwill 498

ON A CONTEMPORARY ANTHOLOGY. By Margaret Widdemer 500

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 500

DRAMA: Lessons from Ibsen. By L. L. 501

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 502

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 503

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

Subscription Rates—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

OWING to labor difficulties affecting practically all New York shops printing periodicals other than the daily press, the present number of *The Nation* has been greatly delayed. The fall book supplement, scheduled for this week, has necessarily been deferred. The absence of certain regular features from this issue is to be explained on the same ground.

ACTION affecting the peace treaty, and more particularly the League of Nations, has been taken recently in three countries: the King of Italy has ratified the agreement by royal proclamation, the French Chamber of Deputies has accepted it, and the United States Senate has rejected the Fall amendments. The action of the King of Italy was strikingly undemocratic, since it was possible only because Parliament was dissolved, and Parliament had been dissolved expressly to obtain a new and more representative legislature to deal with peace issues. The most important of these—from the Italian standpoint—is the disposition of Fiume, which is affected not by the German but by the Austrian treaty. Still, Vittorio Emanuele's assumption to speak for the Italian people in so important a matter as the German settlement shows what slight attention is being paid to the popular will in any of the decisions that embody the results of the Allies' war for democracy. In the French Chamber of Deputies, where the peace treaty was accepted by a vote of 372 to 53, the debate showed that France was expecting nothing from the League of Nations and was relying rather upon the British and American protective treaties. The acceptance of the peace treaty was followed by a discussion of a plan to put before the Allied and Associated Powers further proposals for the safety of France, while a resolution was introduced to set up a new international body that would apparently supersede the League of Nations. Both the friends of reservations and of unconditional ratification profess to take comfort from the vote in the United States Senate whereby the thirty-five amendments to the peace treaty proposed by Senator Fall were defeated. The main fact in the situation, however, is that on each of the four roll-calls taken the vote in favor of the amendments was more than one-third of the total. This puts in black and white what has long been generally conceded: that the two-thirds vote necessary to pass the peace treaty cannot be obtained without the inclusion of reservations.

IT is hard to understand why some persons in this country are so annoyed because an American naval force was sent ashore at Trau, Dalmatia, to chase out Italian troops that had taken possession of the town. It is true that Italy is our ally (and even friend) and that we have taken a very different course in regard to Fiume. Still, there was this difference, that the Italians in Trau were easier chasing than those in Fiume, where the curtain fire of a famous poet's fourteen-inch oratory offered a new and difficult problem in offensive warfare. Besides, it is hard to see why any one should object to a sortie like that at Trau when there is a red-blooded American naval force off shore that needs exercise. Moreover, this habit of attacking an ally (and even friend) should have no terrors for us after a prolonged if not brilliant campaign upon two fronts against Russia, a country that sacrificed infinitely more to defeat Germany than we did. One suspects that the criticism of the action at Trau rests on the belief that, so far as yet appears, the Italian invaders were 100 per cent. safe and sane and had never been heard to utter a word against the present political and economic order. We submit that all the Administration needs to do in order to silence criticism is to produce some more Sisson documents by which it will appear that one of the Italian invaders had once written a pamphlet in favor of syndicalism (or possibly against it—this would be immaterial); that another had been heard to favor free speech; that a third had doubted the right of banks to make forty per cent. profits; and that a peculiarly dangerous fellow had allowed the Government to drag him off to war while owing his landlord ten lire in rent. Let these facts be established by one of the methods that the Government understands, and criticism will cease.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL, like Mr. Wilson, has for some time been conducting a private war on Russia, and he has displayed, in explaining his course to an inquisitive public, an ingenuity worthy of our President in his most inspired moments. Yet several disconcerting facts have recently leaked out which give the lie to Mr. Churchill's re-

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peated assurances that the British Government policy contemplates the early evacuation of Russia, and which have brought down upon his head a storm of criticism in which even the jingo press has taken part. An interview with General Ironside in June is quoted by *The Daily Express* from a suppressed number of *The Gazette of the Archangel Expeditionary Force*. It shows that in June the British commander at Archangel was making plans for an ambitious offensive move, although Mr. Churchill announced on June 6 his policy of immediate withdrawal. A letter from Colonel Sherwood-Kelly, recently of the Relief Force in North Russia, to *The Daily Express* is added evidence of Mr. Churchill's duplicity. The officer found that the Relief Force was being used, not for defence, but "for offensive purposes, on a large scale and far in the interior, in furtherance of some ambitious plan of campaign the nature of which we were not allowed to know." Mr. Churchill "came back" in an official statement, declaring the irrevocability of the decision to withdraw, but emphasizing the difficulty of doing so without injury to the North Russian Government and army. This tender solicitude for the North Russian Government is explained by Colonel Sherwood-Kelly. It is a poor thing, but Mr. Churchill's own, and it is in danger of collapsing the minute British aid is withdrawn. The French papers have added to the embarrassment of the War Minister by publishing a "secret accord" alleged to have been made between Great Britain and the new Northwest Russian Government (also British-inspired) in which Britain undertakes to supply its creature with munitions and extend to it a credit up to a billion rubles. The Northwest Government, in exchange, recognizes Britain's special interest in the Baltic, acknowledges the debts of the old Empire, and agrees to declare, after the fall of Petrograd, its disinterestedness in respect of Persia. Verily, Great Britain's is a busy Government, and not the least occupied of its members is Mr. Churchill. And not the least perplexing of Mr. Churchill's tasks is the important one of concealing from his left hand what his right hand doeth.

WE are having troubles of our own in Siberia. As long ago as June 10, according to Vladivostok news reports, the chamber of commerce of that city passed a resolution criticising the local American troops for being biased and formal (whatever that may mean) in guarding the railroad, for hindering the Government and people in suppressing the Bolsheviki, and for regarding the leaders of Bolshevist bands as government officials. The same meeting unanimously passed a resolution thanking the Japanese army for their work against the Bolsheviki. In reply to the first resolution General Graves made this peppery retort: "The American Headquarters state that they can have nothing to do with entering into a controversy with people who have so little regard for the truth." Alleged scurrilous statements in a certain Vladivostok newspaper, together with the action of General Kalmikov's Cossacks in seizing an American captain and corporal and flogging the latter, recently led General Graves, after threatening the newspaper with suppression, to hold up a shipment of 14,000 rifles intended for the Omsk Government. An appeal from the latter brought prompt action from our State Department, which ordered the rifles released at once. We are moving in a fog in Siberia, and no one here is allowed to know what complications may ensue. Apparently our troops are running the railroad, while British, French, and Japanese soldiers fight Bolsheviki; consequently anti-Bolshevist Siberians do not like us. Meanwhile, according to *The Russian Coöperative News*, "the economic conquest of Eastern Siberia by Japan goes on at such a pace that it is difficult to give a correct report on the situation at any given time." General Ooi has just presented to the municipality of Vladivostok 600 Japanese-Russian dictionaries to facilitate the study of Japanese. When it comes to spreading trade by the sword, we make a poor third. For our part, we wish a return to a policy of being honest and minding our own business. Bring home the troops!

WHILE our Government carries on war that is no-war in Siberia, it continues as a party to the blockade of Soviet Russia. We cannot believe that the American people really understand the monstrous wickedness of this business of mass starvation. Mass slaughter of combatant men was long since sanctified as a means of attaining political ends; it has remained for this war to show fully what the world's rulers can do in deliberately starving entire peoples. America is not legally at war with Russia (as though that made any difference); every dictate of common-sense indicates the impossibility of changing the Russians' ideas by starving their women and babies; yet the ghastly work goes on. The Russian Economic Relief Committee, formed last spring as a non-partisan body for the aid of the suffering people of Central Russia, irrespective of their political affiliations, has been unable to accomplish anything; it is holding a mass-meeting at Cooper Union on October 11 to protest against the blockade. So far as we can learn, both Bolshevist and anti-Bolshevist Russians, excepting only the *émigrés*, agree that the blockade ought to be lifted and foreign intervention ended. Common-sense and common humanity support them. But the wise men who govern the world today know better.

HOW effective their method is, reports coming out of Central Europe continue to show. The Society of Friends, which almost alone among the better-known Christian religious bodies continued during the war to bear testimony to the teachings of Jesus, as long ago as February obtained from the British Government a permit to send hospital supplies and food for babies and mothers to enemy countries. Through the American Friends' Service Committee, at 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, we have just received some of the reports of the British Friends in Germany, Austria, and Hungary. Miss Marion C. Fox writes in July that twenty-five per cent. of the children in the towns have rickets; "many cannot stand, the bones do not grow, and they will always be dwarfs. If the 140,000 milch cows are taken, it will mean the death of 600,000 more children within six months." From Vienna Dr. Hilda Clark reports that sixty per cent. of the children of the better working classes have severe rickets, and scarcely one is free from the slighter degrees. "The toddlers of one to five years," she says, "are hardly seen in the streets; for they can hardly toddle, and unless you undress them and ask their ages you would not realize what had happened." At the Berlin City Children's Asylum, 920 children were received during June; 347 of them died. The average weight of children at nine months old was under eight and one-half pounds; at seventeen months, sixteen pounds. From Berlin Miss Joan Fry wrote in July: "The effect of the blockade will go on getting worse for years to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come. No raising of it now can do more than prevent fresh cases, if that." We could fill pages with similar testimony from these Quaker workers. The situation is apparently beginning to be understood abroad. The British Government has agreed to meet private subscriptions for relief up to the sum of £200,000, and *The Manchester Guardian* has opened a relief fund. In the face of such reports as we have quoted, no words are strong enough to characterize any proposal to re-impose the blockade on the Central Powers or to continue it against Russia.

HOW many readers of *The Nation* are aware that a serious issue has arisen in the relations between the United States and Great Britain over the Anglo-Persian agreement? Almost none, we venture to say, if they have relied upon our great dailies for information. On the inside pages under modest headlines items are buried which contain such sentences as these: "The reply of the State Department to the request of the British Government that the United States approve the Anglo-Persian treaty is known to be one of the sharpest and most caustic notes sent to the London Foreign Office in recent years. . . . This government takes the position that the treaty violates the principles underlying the League of Nations and that, while the League is not yet organized, the acceptance of its principles by the Powers at Paris morally obliged all the signatories to abstain from practices contrary to their letter." But, of course, the thrifty British Government does not agree to this view. It does not see why it should not have slipped one over on the rest of the world while waiting for the various nations to ratify the treaty; why let anyone else have those nice oil wells and the dominating position in Persia? Why not give one's self a mandate for Persia and thus save the League of Nations a lot of bother and trouble? Nothing could illustrate more clearly than this happening the spirit in which some of our Allies are entering into the League. It is the same old kind of land-grabbing which Mr. Wilson has so solemnly assured us belongs to an era that has passed. Of course, Great Britain denies our contention that this treaty, in addition to all its other bad aspects, was forced upon the Persian people against their wish, and Lord Curzon has explained, precisely as Great Britain always has explained on taking over countries, "that she has no desire to Anglicize, Indianize, or Europeanize it [Persia] in any sense of the term." Finally, we have the delightful assurance that the correspondence between our Government and the British Government in this matter will not be made public. How pleasant it is to live in the days of open diplomacy after the manner of Mr. Wilson!

PRESIDENT WILSON'S conference of capital and labor duly met at Washington on Monday last, without the slightest programme for its procedure, without even any agenda to help it on its way. Its members were informed by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, that there lay before them the modest task of establishing "institutions that will promote the welfare of mankind down through the ages. . . . If you, in the abundance of your combined wisdom and experience, can produce an acceptable document of this character, the results of your work will find a place in the hearts of men like the Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Emancipation Proclamation." This simple little undertaking ought surely to keep the conference busy for some days. Unfortunately, there seems to be growing doubt whether the conference can produce anything worth while, much less a new charter of industry to rank with what Mr. Gladstone declared was the greatest document struck off at any one time by a group of men—the United States Constitution. True, the railroad brotherhoods decided at the last moment to take part after having withheld their consent at first on account of what they considered the undemocratic labor representation. Further, the few changes made in the original personnel appointed on behalf of the public were a distinct improvement as, for instance, the selection of Miss Lillian Wald. The fact remains that the list is a perfectly hopeless one as a whole, for the liberal forces in the community are almost wholly without representation. The prospect is, therefore, that if any sort of agreement is reached, it will be a sort of Civic Federation, good Lord, good Devil affair. Most of the members of the conference have been left so far behind in the progress of events as to make it impossible, we fear, for them really to contribute anything of value. We hope we err in our judgment of the conference, but the interest in the situation lies at present only in the action of the progressive railroad representatives.

A FIGHT to a finish betwen the economic and the political power of Great Britain has again been narrowly averted by the national genius for accommodation. Fragmentary and obviously biased press reports of the ten-day railway strike that ended on October 6 give singularly little information concerning the exact demands of the men, though the standardization of wages at war levels was involved. The rank and file of the workers apparently forced the hand of their leaders, who seem to have been inclined throughout to moderate action. The Government, on the other hand, from the beginning took an uncompromising position, and the Premier did not hesitate to suggest that an "anarchist conspiracy" lay behind the outbreak. All the railway men of Great Britain, numbering some 600,000, went out, and for a week there was serious question whether they would not be joined by the transport workers and the miners, while the printers, in protest against alleged unfair treatment of strike news, for a time threatened to tie up certain of the newspapers. In fact, it looked at one point as though England might face a widespread working-class revolt against the Government. A hastily organized service by motor lorries kept food moving to the cities, and the Government met with wide response in an appeal for volunteers to carry on necessary transport work. Mr. Lloyd George repeatedly declared that until the men had gone back to work he would never, never negotiate with them—well, on second thought, hardly ever. Having made his heroic gesture, he got down to business, and the strike was promptly settled. Wages are to be stabilized at the present rates up to September 30, 1920, and no adult railwayman is to receive less than fifty-one shillings a week while the cost of living remains not less than 110 per cent. above the prewar level. Both sides claim the victory. With rumors of Sir Eric Geddes's resignation persistently circulating, however, and with Mr. Thomas's followers singing "The Red Flag" within the walls of No. 10 Downing Street after the settlement was reached, we gather that the strikers were not unduly discouraged at the outcome. Meanwhile the real issue remains; and as one feature of their campaign railwaymen and miners are pressing for nationalization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Gary Moralizes

TO see the leader of a tottering order make a final gallant stand is always a moving spectacle, and Mr. Gary's appearance before the Senate Committee of inquiry into the steel strike savored much of the dramatic. He thrilled with the consciousness of his duty, of the responsibility upon him to save society. So he battled bravely—with complete futility. Even the Senators who heard him felt the wrongfulness of his position, despite his assertion that it was a moral issue upon which he took his stand and that as such it could not be compromised. That it is an advance for corporation magnates to talk of moral principles at all instead of merely damning government and public, we are happy to concede. But is there a moral principle at stake? To our minds not at all. The immediate issue is simply whether Mr. Gary should or should not meet a group of union officials. He declined because, he said, they represented only a fraction of his employees. Here to his mind was the moral issue. So Senator Jones asked him whether the reason he took this attitude was his belief that the committee represented only a minority of his employees or a feeling of hostility to the officials of organized labor: "It is," said the Senator, "one or the other." "I refuse," replied Mr. Gary, "to change my thought or my expression in substance, and that is that we refuse to do anything that will result in the closed shop against the open shop." At once Senator Walsh pierced his armor: "Do you mean to say, Mr. Gary, that if these men represented ninety per cent. of your men you would refuse to confer with them because it might be a step toward the recognition of the closed shop as against the open shop?" Promptly the moral issue disappeared. "I have not said that," fenced Judge Gary, "because no such situation has come up." As if a true moral principle could be altered by a change in numbers!

On the day before (October 2) Senator Borah had similarly disposed of the moral issue: "Suppose the committee [of union men] had said to you, Judge—and I am asking this question for the purpose of getting this issue as I understand it before the committee—suppose they had said to you that fifteen per cent. of your men had been unionized and as the representatives of these unions, we come to discuss with you, as union men, certain questions. Would you have met them?" Again the moral issue faded out of Judge Gary's mind. "I am not prepared to say I would not, Senator," was the reply. "Well, if you had met them that would have demonstrated the proposition of the open shop?" queried Mr. Borah. "No, I do not think it would," was the astounding reply; "that might depend upon circumstances."

We have no desire to be hard upon Judge Gary—not even as hard as he is upon himself. He is honest beyond question, and within his limited circle of ideas far from being wholly wrong, in our judgment. He stands four-square for the old American tradition of individual liberty. So do we, and glory in it. He believes that unions, in their efforts to regulate conditions of work, often unjustly restrict the rights of individual workers. So do we. He believes that they often cut down production by preventing employees from doing their best and by restricting the freedom of employers to introduce labor-saving machinery and economical organization. So do we. He believes such restriction not only uneconomical and unwise, but at bottom morally wrong. So do we. The instinct of workmanship that is in men will support the Steel Trust chairman in proclaiming the moral obligation of every man to give the full possibilities of service that are in him. That is written on the tablets of the human heart.

But this is the utmost that can be said for Judge Gary. An industrial autocrat, he dwells in a dying industrial world, not understanding in the least how to meet the issue he has clearly and correctly perceived. That is apparent from his admission that the existing order is not safe for the public and that there must be greater control of both capital and labor—by the Government! In his own words:

> I can see that the power of concentrated capital necessarily involves the power to do more or less harm. I recognize the fact personally that concentrated capital has the advantage over a single individual if the concentrated capital is in the hands of dishonest and unfair men; and, therefore, I think, it is no more than right for concentrated capital to be subject to supervision and control against wrong because the ultimate prosperity and happiness of a country depend upon a thing being right—fundamentally right. And in that connection I want to say I think that to the same extent that capital is subjected to supervision and control by law, to the same extent concentrated labor should be subject to the supervision and control of the law and the Government.

So he urges Federal licensing for and control of the great corporations! In other words, precisely as the railroad presidents have done, he seeks refuge in the present emergency in *more governmental control of his own business.* This, from the men who have been parading up and down the land for years denouncing Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Congress, the whole country, for interfering in private business, is delightfully amusing. Yet these same men have nothing constructive to offer; no reorganization which would combine the benefits of individual enterprise and sagacity with democratic organization of their industries. They denounce Mr. Plumb as a Bolshevist when he shows them a way out between the Scylla of government management and interference on the one hand and the Charybdis of autocratic private control on the other.

In refusing to meet the strikers, Mr. Gary is utterly in the wrong. He and his stockholders, possessors of America's richest stores of coal and iron, cannot afford to win this strike by the method of fighting it out. If they crush it in this wise, they plant the seeds of hatred, of bitterness, and of rancor against a system of production which today leaves actual control in the hands of a few men. That system, in a world of democratic striving, must, we repeat, be democratized. In what spirit shall the reorganization be undertaken? If the steel officials crush the strike, that work may be initiated in a spirit of arrogance on one side and of burning anger on the other—an anger dangerous to our government and our democracy.

Let Judge Gary be warned that in his blindness he is opposing the invincible spirit of human freedom, in revolt against autocracy in industry no less than in government. It works blindly in the steel strike; but it works with open eye and understanding mind wherever men are striving for the abolition of privilege and the upbuilding of genuinely democratic organization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Hatred of England

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You have, very properly as I think, opposed the tendency towards war with Mexico and Japan, and have given some good advice against meddling in Russian affairs. But at the same time (and I think this shows how little you really care for peace and justice) you have embraced every opportunity to stir up trouble between the United States and Great Britain. I therefore do not think your attitude is honest, and *The Nation* has lost all authority as a critic of public events. You have accepted the claims of the Irish agitators, knowing full well how false their statements generally are and how absurd and dangerous their projects. You have made much of the alleged discontent in India, knowing full well that to weaken the British power there would be to plunge three hundred and fifty million people into religious and racial warfare. You seem to imply that if British rule ceased in Egypt the Egyptians would govern that country. Your animus is plainly anti-British and pro-German. Your pacifism doesn't trouble me. I can respect a genuine pacifist. But the policy of *The Nation* is neither genuine nor pacifist. I'm sorry to lose my respect for *The Nation*.

WE are glad to print the above letter, because we have received two or three others of a similar tenor and because one of our valued Canadian contributors has severed his connection with *The Nation* in view of his belief that it is anti-British.

Our critics forget that for fifty years *The Nation* has charted its course according to principle. It has been, for instance, unalterably opposed to war and devoted to the cause of free trade. A profound believer in democracy, it has from the very beginning of its career been antagonistic to imperialism wherever imperialism has manifested itself. Under Mr. Godkin's editorship it bitterly criticised the imperialism of the North in the South during the reconstruction period. It broke with President Cleveland in the Venezuelan crisis and denounced him for bringing the United States to the very verge of war with Great Britain, with the result that Mr. Godkin himself was pictured as a renegade American, a recipient of Cobden Club gold, a British tool. It opposed the war with Spain and the conquest of the Philippines as it has opposed our later manifestations of imperialism, such as our unholy seizure and conquest of Santo Domingo and Haiti.

Why, then, having refused to remain silent in the presence of wrong-doing by its own country, should *The Nation* be expected to connive at or consent to British imperialism? With all deference to our correspondent, it does believe in self-determination for the Irish as for the Filipinos, and for the natives of Egypt and India as a matter of course. We have repeatedly during the last two years reaffirmed our allegiance to the profoundest truth ever uttered by Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern any other man without that other man's consent." The situation of India could scarcely be much worse than it is under the British régime, under which the Indian people are repeatedly scourged by preventable famine, and under which they are not provided with education, only seven per cent. being literate after 150 years of British rule.

If all of this implies hatred of Great Britain, then must we be charged with hating every nation that today holds in its sway an unwilling people. We have in the past dwelt upon the sins of the French in Cochin China and in Madagascar and of the Germans wherever they have set foot upon any foreign soil. More will be found in *The Nation* about German colonial misgovernment than in the files of any similar publication; and we are glad to recall the fact that when American college presidents and college professors were burning incense before the Kaiser and accepting decorations and autographed pictures, *The Nation* was under no illusion whatever either as to the utter brutality and wickedness of German militarism or as to the true character of its guilty ruler. But why labor the point? The principles of *The Nation* are of international application and they are not modified by national pride, nor blood-ties, nor hands across the sea.

So we shall continue to oppose the present ministry of England and to pray for its early downfall. We rejoice to know that the Administration in Washington protests against the latest manifestation of British imperialism—the Persian treaty. If to do this is to hate England, then we find ourselves in remarkably good English company. For we stand and have stood with *The Manchester Guardian, The Daily News, The Nation, The Daily Herald, Common Sense,* and many another British publication which denounced the barbarities and wrong-doing of the British armies in South Africa two decades ago, and now speak out hourly against most of the Lloyd George policies. Against the secret treaties and against the crooked diplomacy of which the British Government has been a past master we shall protest until the day we cease publication, or a new spirit comes into the British Foreign Office—and our own State Department as well. As long as these foreign offices are managed as they are, we want no League of Nations to be dominated by them and no Anglo-American alliance to impose its will upon the world. What they have jointly done in Russia these last two years is quite enough for us.

Haters of England? A thousand times, no! We have no words adequate to express our debt to England's leadership toward personal and communal liberty from Magna Charta down. For every statue of Lincoln set up in England we would place three in America to Bright and Cobden. For England's devotion to free trade we are under an obligation of gratitude impossible of repayment. To her our eyes are turned today as to no other land, because we know that the mass of her people have no sympathy with the wrong-doing of their rulers and because we feel so sure that in England will come first the breaking of the new day; that her Hendersons, her MacDonalds, her Morleys, her Massinghams, her Smillies, and her Russells are bound to find the way out; and that they are serving the best that is in America as they lead toward a newer and better democracy. If they fail or are false to their trust the whole forward movement in America will be set back; if they succeed we shall profit, without suffering all their pangs and pains. Of no other country can this be said in the same degree. Surely the bulk of Americans are drawn to the English people as to no other. But to do lip service to a Government headed by such a man as Lloyd George, when one thinks what injury the official British propaganda has done to this country in the last five years, when one recalls how Balfour and Lloyd George withheld from America, their ally, all knowledge of the secret treaties, is to make *against* and not *for* the true British-American alliance which, if it is to survive, must be based upon mutual respect, confidence, and fair dealing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Geography of the Sea

THE dispute between the United States and Great Britain over the allocation of certain oil tankers in German ports, and the consequent refusal of the War Department to surrender the Imperator and seven other vessels, is only an incident in the process of reëstablishing on a peace basis the ocean commerce of the world, but, as often happens, the incident is receiving more public notice than the vastly more important process itself. That the Great War changed the land geography of the world is a familiar story; that it changed equally, or even more, the geography of the sea is less understood. Yet since 1914 great mercantile fleets, as well as great political powers have been brushed from the map and new ones have appeared; trade routes, like territorial boundaries, have been altered.

Fortunately, reconstruction in shipping is further advanced than that ashore, and figures recently made public by Lloyd's show that in spite of losses by submarines the world emerges from four years of war with slightly greater ocean carrying facilities than before. There are about 51,000,000 gross tons afloat today against some 49,500,000 in July, 1914. This growth, although much less than the rate for the fifteen years preceding the war, shows that the present shortage of ships is a matter not of net loss but of increased demand.

Reconstruction of ocean commerce does not consist merely in restoring what existed before the war. An entire readjustment to changed conditions is necessary, with the result that new ocean highways, new sea lanes, are coming into existence all over the world. The present and prospective dependence of Europe on the New World is seen in the importance that is given to North, Central, and South America in the establishment of routes. The wreck of Europe's agricultural and manufacturing industries not only means larger demands upon the three Americas for many years, but means the supply of new products. Ten years ago, for instance, it was not believed that America could build up an export trade in coal against England, in view of the higher labor cost here and the greater distance of the mines from tidewater. Today changed conditions in England, and the prostration of mining in France and Germany, have made coal an export most important to us and most vital to Europe. That continent is asking for 81,000,000 tons from us this winter, four times our pre-war exports, although, according to the United States Shipping Board, European countries are generally expecting that this be transported in American bottoms while reserving their own vessels for more profitable cargoes.

The food demands of Europe, which must continue heavier than before the war, may have an even more important effect upon Central and South America than upon the United States. The export of tropical fruits and vegetables from those regions to the United States had become a sizable industry before the war, but so far as Europe was concerned was confined almost entirely to bananas, and even this trade had been developed to only part of its possibilities. Recognition of the opportunities before Central and South America as fruit and vegetable purveyors to the world is seen in a recent demand made by Porto Ricans upon the Emergency Fleet Corporation for one hundred refrigerator ships to carry the products of that island alone to waiting markets. The war has also greatly enlarged the sphere of the frozen meat trade. Previous to 1914 England was virtually the only one of the European countries using refrigerated meat. The war has accustomed most of them to it.

The enhancement in the importance of the three Americas in supplying international needs is seen in the post-war programme of the Cunard Line, which, as *The Nautical Gazette* recently suggested, seems to have borrowed the motto of the Hamburg-American Company, "My Field is the World," and to be reaching out to fill the gap left by the wreck of that once world-girdling fleet. Besides resuming its pre-war routes, the Cunard has lately organized lines between Philadelphia and London and Philadelphia and Bristol, as well as started a Boston-Australia service and one between New York and the Levant. The company's belief in the increased importance of the United States as a shipping field is further indicated in its plan to erect a twenty-one story office building in New York. Japanese shipping companies are also reaching out toward the Americas. Among other ventures the Japanese are now routing vessels around the world via the Cape of Good Hope, Cuba, New Orleans, and the Panama Canal; and have begun direct service to West Indian ports through the Canal.

According to figures collected by Lloyd's, the sea-going shipping of the United States advanced from 2,027,000 gross tons in June, 1914, to 9,773,000 gross tons in June of this year, placing this country second only to Great Britain in respect to her merchant fleet. The United States Shipping Board announced a few weeks ago that, although 2,400,000 deadweight tons of shipping were still in the service of the army and navy, 729 vessels, aggregating 4,248,971 deadweight tons, had been released for general commerce, and were employed on regular cargo routes or in tramp service. The Shipping Board appears to be devoting particular attention to South America, which in the past has been viewed chiefly as a continent to which to export our merchandise. There has been a lack of return cargo except from Brazil. Before the war a large share of the vessels that left American ports for Argentina did not return direct, but loaded wheat for Europe at Buenos Aires or Bahia Blanca, and eventually returned to the United States with manufactured products from Europe. America's growing needs for food and raw materials make it probable that henceforward we shall use more of South America's products.

Throughout history the movement toward international trade has had to fight narrower nationalistic conceptions which have sought to restrict and artificialize it by customs tariffs, embargoes, and other means. "Freedom of the seas," for which Mr. Wilson nominally urged America into war but which completely slipped his mind at the peace table, is, after all, a minor issue. It concerns the protection of private property at sea in time of war; and the making of rules for the next international conflict is not the world's most important work just now—especially as all wars, once they get going, make their own rules, oblivious of previous good offices in their behalf. Freedom of trade, however, is a true peace-maker and peace-keeper and in the long run the sound economic and political rule for every nation. The one country that has practiced it most consistently has built up the world's greatest merchant marine, and the experience of Great Britain is to be pondered by those who are making the new geography of the sea.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY
BEREA, OHIO

Omaha

FOR more than half a century have we had the problem of the freed Negro confronting us; and during all that time the Federal Government has concerned itself practically not at all with his economic or moral status. There has been no effort to receive him into our political life save for political ends—which made a difficult matter worse. We have had a Rural Life Commission, but none to investigate the life, rural and urban, of these millions of disfranchised, neglected, and disliked citizens. We have had the Walsh Commission on Industrial Relations—and it deliberately and disgracefully avoided all questions affecting the Negro; it had sobs for the lot of the tenant farmer in Texas; it had no eyes for millions of black tenants there and elsewhere. A country that has boasted its ability to solve all its problems has, as a nation, not even grappled with this one. More than that, it has kept silent in the face of the outraging of our Constitution to the Negro's hurt, the shaking of our very structure of law and order, and the violation of many of the most sacred pledges of individual liberty and equality.

And now we are reaping the whirlwind. Chicago, Washington, Omaha—they and a hundred other places make true prophets of those who declared that our participating in the "war for democracy" without providing democracy for our submerged black tenth could have only one result; that conscripting blacks by the hundred thousand to extend democracy by bloodshed would have its day of reckoning. Is the Southern Negro lawless? He is, on the contrary, the most law-abiding peon in the world. In New York city alone there were 230 men indicted for rape in 1914; far more than the Negroes accused of the crime in the South. There are more recorded cases of rape in the city of Chicago each year than among the entire Negro population in the South. But if it were true that the Negro is filled with bestial lust, and is degenerate, who is responsible? Who but the white men who have had absolute control of the Negro, body and soul, since he landed on these shores? Save in a few sections, he neither makes the laws nor helps to govern; the education of the bulk of the race is the veriest farce. But the Negro is economically a competitor and when to a man who is a labor competitor there is added a dark color of the skin you have one of the despised, be he Filipino or Japanese or Chinese or Mexican or "Dago." The Negro has become a more vital factor in economic life in the North during the war; his demand for houses presses hard upon others likewise short of dwellings. The sporadic crime of rape, the one surest to arouse every violent passion, affords the excuse to satiate a thirst for revenge that has its roots deep.

So we have Chicago, Washington, Omaha; and so we shall have others. The remedies? Here are a few: (1) a law making lynching a Federal crime; (2) the swift, legal punishment of the criminal, as in Camden, New Jersey, where one began serving a sentence of twenty to thirty years fifteen hours after his arrest; (3) the equally certain punishment of all mob-members; (4) the immediate institution of a race commission to study and make public the truth about the problem; and (5) the absolute guarantee to the Negro of all the political and social rights to which he is entitled under the Constitution of the United States. Must more Mayors be hung up, more cities go mad in Berserker wrath, before the President and the Congress awake to the gravity of the situation?

Adelina Patti

THE mother of the late Adelina Patti taught her child the art of dressmaking, because "a voice is easily lost and the operatic stage is a most uncertain bread-winner." In this case it proved a certain one. At the age of seven, Patti began to sing the florid arias of Rossini in public and soon earned enough to enable her parents—both of them opera singers—to bring home their pawned jewels and costumes; and when her professional career was ended, nearly sixty years later, she had gathered in more than four million dollars. In this country, after 1882, she never sang for less than $5,000 a performance.

What was the secret of this extraordinary success? Was it a success chiefly with the masses, as in the cases of Galli-Curci and John McCormack, or were the classes equally entranced? They were—they simply couldn't help it. They had to admit that, except in comic parts, like Rosina, Norina, and Zerlina, she was not much of an actress; that she lacked temperament and general intelligence (she seldom read a book or took the slightest interest in scientific, political, or even æsthetic topics, and when asked for an explanation of her art she replied "Je n'en sais rien"); that, consequently, a modern dramatic rôle would have been entirely beyond her—a fact she deeply regretted, for she loved Wagner's music and repeatedly attended the festivals at Bayreuth; that even Marguerite in "Faust," Valentine in "Les Huguenots," Leonora in "Il Trovatore," and Carmen, all of which she did attempt, were beyond her powers. These things had to be admitted by critical listeners, and yet they enjoyed her singing hugely.

Two things explain her enduring vogue. She was the most brilliant singer that ever lived, the "Paganini of vocal virtuosity," as Leng called her. Colorature, or ornamental song, was her specialty, and the public dearly loves vocal fireworks. It applauds them frantically even when they are very far from flawless, as in the case of Galli-Curci. What made serious, carping critics laud Patti to the skies and applaud with the crowd, was that her colorature was usually flawless as well as dazzling and that it was sung with a voice of exquisite purity in timbre and pitch, and of a voluptuous sweetness probably never equalled. Florid music is really instrumental in character, as the Italian masters of the *bel canto* epoch themselves admitted; but Patti made it seem vocal—made it seem as natural and as easy as bird song.

Other admirable traits of the world's most famous singer were that, although she appeared mostly in operas of an inferior æsthetic genre, she did not indulge in the exaggerations with which so many of her rivals secured cheap applause from the gallery. She set a good example to other singers by the great care she took of her voice. Nothing could tempt her to sing in public more than three times a week, or to appear when not in perfect health. Her extraordinary vocal cords and amazing memory made it unnecessary for her to devote much time to practice and rehearsing; but she did, as her friend Hanslick attested, exercise solfeggios daily for half an hour. She found it unnecessary to go over her rôles though she had not sung them for years. A remarkable artist, altogether. It is no wonder that three countries claim her as their own: Spain, because she was born in Madrid (1843); Italy, because her father was a Sicilian, her mother a Roman; and America, because she came to New York as a child of three and grew up here.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Going Back—and Why

By GEORGE SEIBEL

SO opulent has been the Pactolus of blood during the years past that those organized enterprises which the agitator calls the Interests were by no means yearning for peace when it came. They knew their fat years were at an end, with an era of industrial unrest in prospect. This was so widely understood that the shadow of a pigeon-feather or an olive-branch was enough to unsettle the stock market, while the man who dared to whisper "peace" was denounced as an enemy of society, and his whisper drowned as effectually as possible by drum, trumpet, and hurrah.

But peace came—it could not be averted by the shouts of those who were waging war from pit and counting-house. A vast army of men engaged in the ancillary industries of Mars has been thrown out of work. Another vast army, returning from battle-fields and trenches, is seeking employment in peaceful enterprises. There should be plenty for them to do. Reconstruction is necessary in many fields, and many tasks neglected during the past four years should be taken up afresh and pushed to completion. The building trades throughout our land, still languishing because of labor's demands and the high cost of materials, will receive a new impetus when this deadlock is overcome by mutual concessions. In the same way many other enterprises, especially those that provide the world with luxuries, will soon be resumed on a larger scale, in reaction after years of repression and retrenchment. All in all, there should be no more fear of an oversupply in the labor market than there is of the Kaiser's moving into that Riverside Drive mansion which he was reported to have acquired as a place of refuge. Undoubtedly there has been an immediate increase in the number of available workers, but that increase should soon be swallowed up by the demand for new work in many fields to replace what has been destroyed and to catch up with what has been neglected.

On the other hand, a real menace may soon arise of which some captains of industry are vaguely apprehensive. The shortage of labor which came during the early years of the war employers were inclined to attribute to reservists being called home to European lands by their Governments. Several hundred thousand citizens enlisted in various arms of the service; several millions were later taken by conscription. Thus the labor market was drained, until wages rose to a level almost unprecedented and almost prohibitive of profitable enterprise. Unskilled workmen in many trades, receiving more than professional men, were making demands upon their employers which a few years ago would have been considered absurd, but now met with eager acceptance.

Since the war is over, this condition for a brief period will be reversed. There may even be a glut of labor for a very short time until enterprise has found new courage and the returning stream has flowed into various channels of readjustment. After that a condition is likely to arise which few of our economic oracles will have foreseen. We are so prone to regard America as the paradise of the world, and ourselves as the cream of creation, our ignorance of the Old World and its peoples is so pitiful, our sympathetic insight into the psychology of the foreigner so deficient, that little account has been taken of the influence which the advent of peace exerted upon the millions of aliens who now form the backbone of our army of unskilled laborers. But these people, by hundreds of thousands, are going home. Disregarding all editorial assurances that America and Paradise are synonymous, they are going home. Unswayed by the spectacle of our superior civilization, they are going home. Unseduced by the siren song of our democracy, they are going home.

That hegira began, and already gave rise to serious disturbances in our industrial life, while the war was still in progress. Outbursts like that at East St. Louis, duplicated on a smaller scale at other points, were a result of the migration of Negroes seeking more profitable fields of labor than the South. In some far western States, legislatures were discussing measures against the importation of coolies, a similar economic influx. These disturbances were only forerunners of what is likely to come when the seas once more are free, when men may return to their ancestral homes in Europe without risk of becoming prisoners of war, falling victim to mine or submarine, or being seized for cannon-fodder. The steamship companies say that several millions of our aliens are awaiting the first opportunity to reëmbark for their home lands. The Savings Bank Section of the American Bankers Association warns us that these men going home will take with them four billion good American dollars. *The Chicago Tribune*, with the materialistic brutality that characterizes a large section of our press, declares "It is a pity that to keep the currency we have to keep the aliens." But the real economic thinker knows that our real loss will be in the human column.

These men are leaving our land for reasons various, few of them flattering to us, in many cases dating back years before the beginning of the great war. Perhaps the chief of all reasons is the steadily mounting cost of subsistence. Hitherto it had been comparatively easy to make a living in this land of plenty. The Hungarian or Italian could thrive upon $6 or $8 a week, could even acquire such luxuries as accordions and such necessities as automatic shotguns, while sending home to his relatives a liberal subsidy or accumulating a snug patrimony to carry back with him. Now that food and clothing and rentals, fares and taxes and all other charges have been forced up beyond the belief of the past generation, the foreigner has begun to realize that he might as well have remained at home, since he has just as little left after having worked much harder, and is just as liable to be drafted for military service.

To all this must be added yet another consideration—the steady increase of embargoes upon the joy of life. We have never had a "Continental Sunday" except at pagan capitals like Coney Island, but the rigors of a new Puritanism are being extended further and further—except in industry. Paradoxically enough, it seems to be a greater sacrilege to play on Sunday than to work, perhaps because the profits of toil may filter into the Lord's treasury, while the coin cast upon the altar of Frivolity is lost to the tithe-box. Sabbatarian legislation up to now has been retarded by the necessity of uniting all forces in order first to vanquish the Demon Rum. Sumptuary legislation that would never be tolerated by a people really free has been fastened upon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many American commonwealths in the name of the Christian virtues. This legislation has usually been promoted by voluble minorities, who have shown such acrimonious intolerance that the majorities have submitted, rather than bear the stigma of scorn.

The outcome has been an inquisitorial tyranny to which no nation of the old world would submit. A traveller on a train in West Virginia recently, approaching Charleston, was surprised to see a man come into the parlor-car, open a suit-case belonging to one of the passengers, rummage through it until he had found a bottle containing liquor, and depart in triumph with the bottle, leaving the suit-case open on the floor. Espionage and denunciation, evils attendant upon such legislation, are flourishing on the one hand, and on the other hand hypocrisy and bitter hate.

The foreigners who come to our land find such proceedings at utter variance with all their conceptions of liberty. The things that are *verboten* in Europe are things of a different sort—things that interfere with others' life, liberty, and happiness—not such as minister to them, though held as reprehensible by Pharisee and Puritan. Such restrictions tend to estrange many of the foreigners who sought our shores during the past three decades, and now form the backbone of our army of unskilled labor.

Yet another element enters into the problem. At all times has the native American, whose own father perhaps was just as green, looked upon the outlander with sovereign contempt. The pet notion that we are the Chosen People flourishes here more luxuriantly than ever in ancient Canaan or modern Prussia. The American idea is always unquestionably the best in the world; what we have done, may be doing, or intending to do, should not be challenged, investigated, or denied admiration. A man from another land, a land that may have been civilized and literary when America was a wilderness, is regarded as an inferior animal; few, indeed, are the Americans who will venture to rebuke a compatriot for such display of national intolerance. Occasionally this does happen, as with a school-principal who saw the unpleasant trait displayed by some of his pupils. Passing along the street one day, he came upon some boys baiting an old Jewish peddler with the name of "sheeny" and pelting him with stones. An hour or two later he caught another group of urchins plaguing an Italian ditch-laborer, calling him "dago" and rifling his dinner-pail. Our principal knew how to dramatize a moral and next morning assembled his entire school in chapel. He did not chastise or scold the guilty—perhaps he could not have found them; but he lectured the whole school upon chivalry to foreigners, and closed with the words: "I want you boys and girls, especially those that go to the Catholic church, always to remember that the Pope is a dago; and you who don't go to the Catholic church might bear in mind that America was discovered by a dago. And I don't want any one of you to forget that Jesus himself was a sheeny."

The foreigner who sought our shores has seen his chances of an easy livelihood steadily dwindling. He has seen his opportunities of enjoyment taken away one by one; he has had contempt and hatred poured upon him year after year; and the war accentuated all these things by stirring up further animosities. The Magyar, the Austrian, the German have heard their fathers and brothers reviled as Huns and barbarians, and one way in which they can show their resentment is by returning to their native lands as soon as they can do so with safety. Furthermore, there is no doubt that European Governments, which, like Canada, understand the value of human raw material, will now offer many inducements to lure back their Lost Tribes.

The result is already apparent. There will be an exodus to Europe. Many mines and mills here may lie idle for lack of labor power. It is vain to expect native Americans to take the place of those despised strangers. We may as well admit that the native American has become rather finical and perhaps a bit lazy. He prefers occupations that will not soil his white hands. If he has muscle, he prefers to exercise it in golf or fox-trotting. The curse put upon Adam he evades as far as he possibly can—for Adam was a foreigner. It was this American attitude that brought us the great influx of foreign labor, Slav and Italian mostly, which in recent years gave so much needless concern to our legislatures, leading them into all manner of strange devices, from the petty persecution of killing the alien's dog to the solemn farce of the literacy test. All was the natural outgrowth of economic egotism. Just as the manufacturer hankered after protective tariffs to shut out foreign competition, so the laborer demanded that immigration be restricted to shut out competition with his commodity.

When the Old World is again feverishly piling up surplus products and dumping them into our harbors, our manufacturers will again clamor for still higher tariff walls. With industry handicapped by scarcity of labor, increasing the difficulties and cost of production, with trades unions demanding further barriers against immigration, undoubtedly there will ensue a period of depression, with anarchist labor troubles, which the Blue Pencil Guild will attribute to the new bogy of Bolshevism. Disturbances such as occurred in East St. Louis and some western States were merely premonitory symptoms of the great upheaval coming. Woe unto the walls of Jericho!

What can be done to avert the catastrophe? The only effective measures will benefit the native no less than the alien. First of all, the clamorous crew who would perpetuate militarism in our country must be relegated to the rear. Next we must bring commodity prices to a level where they can be reached by average wages. Finally, an attitude of fair play toward the foreign stock, a sympathetic comprehension of their psychology, with a rational measure of liberty—in other words, what a host might do to make a guest feel at home—would minimize the peril. For this peril is very real, and is apparent to any one who understands the soul of the foreigner, and who is near enough to hear the ominous bubbling of the Melting Pot.

While the cry was going up to conscript the alien, the alien was storing up in his bosom resentment which now impels him to seek his ancestral home. If he is to be conscripted, he prefers to be conscripted among his own people. If his liberty is to be hedged in, he will at least go to the land where he is not kicked about as an inferior animal. If America will not accord him human rights and civic privileges, he will revenge himself by letting the American do his own dirty work. That is the case the alien has against us, and the verdict he has rendered. Already the list of "Barbers Wanted" in the classified columns gladdens the makers of safety razors, while only the recent swarming of the Attic hive permits the lustration of our boots by a descendant of Pericles and Aspasia. Before another decade we may behold a complete reversal of past legislative policies, with frantic measures to lure back to our shores the aliens who have taken flight.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Individual Liberty in America

By ALICE EDGERTON

INDIVIDUAL liberty, to most of us, is what we have in America and what we had to crush Germany for not having. Judging from our charges against the German autocracy, individual liberty includes, concretely, freedom from petty regulation of personal affairs; freedom from intellectual domination—that conscious formation, particularly of political ideas, which characterized German education—and regard for the individual as an individual, not as a mere block in the national structure. No element of the German system was more bitterly denounced than its subordination of the individual to the institution. Such a theory of liberty would seem to entail in practice freedom of speech and action. Recent intrusions upon individual liberty in America have met no little criticism in liberal journals; but these invasions, however lamentable, have been accounted temporary aberrations due to war in a country normally free. But are we indeed normally free? Is not the easy loss of freedom in time of stress a measure of the thinness of our "freedom"?

We are not, to be sure, subject to constant petty regulation in our daily life. In general, beyond a broad and none too effective care for the public health, we are free to live as messily as we choose. There is one field, however, in which we normally exercise a considerable control over personal concerns. We insist upon an external moral tidiness in matters of sex. Men and women who live together must be married. If they are not, the courts in many States will remove their children as neglected, at least if the family be poor. Persons who are married may not divorce each other in New York except for adultery; in South Carolina they may not divorce each other at all; and in theory people may not be divorced if they agree to secure the separation. Our excuse for the moral restrictions imposed in the various States is that any arrangement other than the prescribed one is categorically wrong, or that it affects adversely the lives of children. In so far as marital arrangements do affect the health, education, and independent growth of children, they should doubtless be subject to some sort of intervention, whether people be rich or poor, married or unmarried. But our social and legal objection is to the variant because of his variation, rather than because his difference from the norm produces this or that result.

Although we are comparatively free in personal conduct in the United States, there are nevertheless flaws in our idea of liberty of thought. Unofficially, and to a limited extent officially, we form the thought of young people through press and school; we consciously aim to produce individuals who think and do just about so. In normal times, this country affords all the freedom such a standard individual needs because there is ample pasturage for him in the vast field of things as they are; but the variant in thought and conduct is candidly, and with approbation, subject to arbitrary regulation by authority.

What are our methods of forming standard thought and adapting the individual to institutions as they are? Plato urges rulers to mould their children into good citizens by carefully selective education. It is particularly important that stories of the gods be expurgated, so that the young may not grow up with ideas of the ill-conduct of their divinities. It is the same with the history of the state; for how can the young love their country if they see its mistakes? The ninety per cent. of our population who never go beyond the elementary schools depend for their ideas of history upon textbooks which are either toneless in their presentation of our part in controversies and of our economic and political policy or undeviatingly laudatory. A little further on in the educational system, civics and economics are taught descriptively, not critically. It is assumed that we have been right in our administration of the public land; in our railroad policy and in our treatment of the Philippines. Our children are under the tutelage of teachers who have grown up under the same uncritical training. For the few who have opportunity for higher education, there is more chance for variety of ideas. It is not that young people should be taught that their country is wrong, but that they should be given a basis for forming a critical opinion. Only so can we develop respect for truth, variety of mental attitude, and the spirit of tolerance which is essential to democracy.

In the patriotic and doubtless public-spirited Americanization leagues, there is a similar danger of conforming minds strictly to the existing order. These leagues, taking the adult immigrant, teach him that we are virtuous and that we are free; implant in him conceptions of America that are pleasant and very good for him, from the point of view of keeping in with his employer; good for the country from the point of view of a rather Prussian nationalism. But such teaching is not necessarily true, nor is it necessarily good for the individual or for democracy.

To an overwhelming degree, the press is in the hands of the "better classes," economic and social. It represents the people who are getting on with things as they are. Its power to keep opinion in a given mould is incalculable; whereas the variant press is too weak financially, and doubtless also too weak in education and efficiency, to survive—much less to exert an effective influence on the public mind. In numberless instances, the successful press has been the advocate of change, the friend of the poor; but it would be strange to expect of it, even at its best, anything subversive of the existing order. At its average, it is intolerant in attitude and unscrupulous in opposition to minority opinion. In our democracy, the variant idea has no sure means of securing a place. When things go on peaceably, we tolerate the little newspapers and leaflets, if they can keep alive; when there is trouble, we make no bones of denying them the mails or putting an end to them by other means.

The Prussian tendency to subordinate the individual to the state or the institution has taken a rather subtle hold on us in America. We have cause in this country to be grateful to the "police power," the intervention of the state in industry to keep men and women healthy for the state. It has done us many a good turn and is likely to do us many more. Compulsory education, factory inspection, minimum wage for women, workmen's compensation, regulation of hours for women have been obtained for us under its name; in its name we are likely to secure regulation of hours and minimum wage for men. It is a philosophy that has been accepted in our courts and used as a subterfuge to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

circumvent the Constitution. But it is a philosophy which may breed an unhealthy nationalism; Germany, too, took good care of her people before the war—not from any love of them, but that they might make a strong nation. Some of the less pleasant aspects of "human conservation" appeared after our entrance into the war. Constantly we hear that we must conserve our man power for the sake of national strength. We have had a campaign for baby welfare. Save our babies' lives—what for? Because the selective draft showed low vitality in our fighting men; because immigration has been cut off and we must develop our own national strength—we can't afford to let them die.

Still less desirable and still more menacing in our commercial country is the subordination of individual life to industry. Industry is in a fair way to become our Kaiser. There is a movement afoot to introduce mental hygiene in our schools—an excellent thing for our children; but its advocates are justifying it specifically on grounds of its value for industry. Welfare work, which may or may not be good for the people worked upon, is undertaken to keep people well and happy, for industry. Education is increasingly for industry. Without question the individual benefits; without question he needs more of all the benefits that he can get for himself and that are in the gift of the community. But it is no democratic philosophy that does not provide for the health, happiness, and intelligence of people for their own sake—with the state of the nation and of industry as strictly incidental considerations.

Most people, under the training we give them, develop comfortable round minds which would have no great trouble even under Prussian control. We have all the freedom the regular people need; but in peace or in war we have not, and do not believe in having, freedom for the "wild" talkers, those that stir up the people—at least when they stir up the people. If they keep quiet, or if there is no wind to spread the flame, we tolerate them or content ourselves with dispelling their effect by branding them ignorant, immoral, anarchist—or more recently Bolshevist. But when they are in a position to produce an effect, we arrest them and clap them into jail. Ours is an individual liberty which will not stand strain. We take a good deal of pride to ourselves that we are religiously free. We do not have much religious instruction in most public schools, or put people in jail for being heretics. It may be noted, to be sure, that no wise public man advertises heterodox religious views; that many States still have blasphemy laws; and that within two years the State of Connecticut had a blasphemy trial. But we are past the days of hunting down and jailing the poor and ignorant for reading the English Bible, and have reached the stage of subduing only the miserables who are politically and economically "wrong."

In peace times, roughly speaking, infringement of the freedom of economic opinion is either private, or, if official, is local and temporary. Yet in 1912 a series of cases in San Diego interested a few of us for a little while. Street meetings were abolished in a district of the city long appropriated to night speeches of all kinds. A Free Speech League was formed, including members of the I. W. W., Socialists, Single Taxers, and members of the American Federation of Labor. On the day the ordinance took effect this organization had a parade, followed by a meeting at the forbidden spot. Forty-one speakers were arrested, with bail fixed at $750, which only a few could raise. Meetings and arrests went on until all the jails were full and those of neighboring towns were invaded. Finally, a free-speech meeting, held in front of the jail—quite outside the forbidden district—was broken up by the police, who drenched the crowd with water. A traffic ordinance was then passed, permitting the police to disperse any obstructive meeting at their discretion. The Free Speech League prepared a petition for the repeal of the ordinance, which was thrown out on the charge that some of its signatures were illegally obtained; and the right to revise the petition was denied. In the meantime, camps were formed outside the town to turn back persons suspected of free-speech associations. A petition for removal of the chief of police and captain of detectives was "placed on file" by the City Council; and the right to address the Council on the subject of this petition was refused on recommendation of the police commissioner. The Council also rejected a petition prepared by a citizens' committee, said to be acceptable to the Free Speech League, providing for a detailed notice of a meeting three hours before it was proposed to hold it. Vigilance committees deported men detained by the police but not legally booked. These activities were approved by the Merchants' Association and by *The San Diego Union.*

The list could be indefinitely multiplied. Calumet, West Virginia, the California hopfields—wherever and whenever there is an issue, we forget our principles of freedom, and the protestant may whistle for the rights of man. We are sincere and well-meaning about it; we are so sure that our way is right that anyone who crassly sets about making things different must perforce be immoral. It is not that we are harsh or necessarily moved only by selfish interests; we have been trained in the belief that things as they are are free, beneficent, stable. We do not understand freedom, or tolerance, which is its foundation.

In other words, a great mass of the American people, possibly the majority, are spiritual autocrats. We do not want individual liberty for the dissenter; to that extent we do not want democracy. Tolerance involves sympathy with the ideas and doings of people unlike ourselves. Prussia had no tolerance. How much have we? To the majority in America, as to the Kaiser in Germany, the good citizen is the acquiescent citizen. We like him courteous and anxious to please, carrying out the Government's plans with the agreeable intelligence of a good housemaid; and since we have politically very little power, most of us are good and serviceable citizens. We like tidiness of personal thought and conduct, a substantial predictability. When the issue is insignificant, or the divergence slight, we laugh or ignore. People who are different are like foreigners to us; if we speak loud they may understand our tongue—we have no interest in theirs. We argue with vast voices and leave the alien prostrate, with conscious virtue under our waistcoats. But once a real issue is at stake, this American "tolerance" vanishes like mist. The divergent idea we spy upon, exclude from the mails, dismiss from the universities. We vituperate, we ostracize. The war simply brought to the surface our raw intolerance. *Vox populi* grew hoarse shouting "skulker," "slacker," "friend of the Kaiser," while in strata too elegant to call names, the minority was deftly deleted from the Social Register. To be sure, war, even for democracy, is necessarily undemocratic. There must be arbitrary decisions, secrecies, coercions. Obedience is its ultimate virtue. This is one of the reasons why war for democracy is strange; it is like killing for Christ. But we have exceeded even the exigencies of war. We have disregarded shades of value and torn up liberty like a weed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is There Bolshevism in Yucatan?

By MANUEL CARPIO

I HAVE read with some interest an article about Yucatan, published recently in *Leslie's Weekly*, and entitled "Bolshevism's Riot of Ruin in Yucatan." Now I have just come from Yucatan, where I have been for a considerable time, and I have first-hand knowledge about conditions there. First of all, I affirm that law and order prevail everywhere in the Yucatan Peninsula, and that people can travel from one place to another without the slightest apprehension for their safety and comfort. Yucatan is working to its full capacity, endeavoring to improve its market conditions, which, although somewhat affected by the war, are recovering the unusual prosperity that was brought about by the movement initiated by General Alvarado in 1915. I will justify this statement by comparing the information given at random in the article to which I have alluded with actual statistics taken from the last reports of the *Comision Reguladora del Mercado de Henequen* in regard to the sales of sisal.

The article says that a little over five years ago "a stream of sisal bales flowed to the Port of Progreso and a stream of gold flowed back, estimated at not less than twenty millions of dollars a year." It might occur to an inquisitive reader to ask whether the whole of those twenty millions went into Yucatan, or if a part, large or small, remained in the United States in the hands of the brokers and middlemen who used to handle the whole output of sisal fibre in the interest of the few financial chieftains in whose hands was the whole destiny of the people of Yucatan. Such was the fact. But today and for many yesterdays, by the fruits of Alvarado's administration, the steady stream flows back to the producers individually.

On page 31 of *The Monthly Crop Report*, published by the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, dated Washington, D. C., March, 1919, there is the following item:

CROP NOTES—MEXICO

The American Consul at Progreso, Yucatan, reports that the *Comision Reguladora* estimates a production of hemp for 1919, of one million bales, with a surplus on hand January 1, 1919, of five hundred thousand bales. The *Reguladora* has, through the Governor of the State of Yucatan, requested the Legislature to pass an act to stop hemp cutting for a time, the State to finance the farmers in cleaning, planting, etc., until the production be again started. They state that if production is not curtailed by law, the price will lower, and there will not be sufficient warehouse space, and that it might be necessary to destroy some of this stock.

If you will read the New Orleans newspapers of February 20, 1919, you will find that the cotton planters of the South were intending to follow an action similar to that adopted by the planters of Yucatan in order to reduce by one-third the acreage devoted to cotton. This is surely no fruit of Bolshevism.

The custom house records at Progreso, the principal port of Yucatan, show that during the year 1915, the one in which General Alvarado took charge of affairs in that State, the value of a limited number of imports, including live stock, vegetables, mineral and chemical products, paper, vehicles, and the like, amounted to seven million dollars, American currency. During Alvarado's two years up to 1917, the actual total of the same importations was fourteen million dollars in American currency, an increase of one hundred per cent. per annum. This is no fruit of Bolshevism, and no grim tragedy has apparently been enacted in the once peaceful and happy Yucatan, if its commercial movement has increased one hundred per cent. in value and importance during the two years of General Alvarado's control.

A community infected by Bolshevism and disorder, where social values have been inverted, does not increase its financial welfare, but diminishes it and even destroys it. Such is not the case with Yucatan, as I will prove by a few more figures. Let us begin with those famous twenty millions stated to be the best annual value of the henequen crop produced by Yucatan before the régime established by General Alvarado. According to the Supplement to the Commerce Reports of the United States, dated April 3, 1918, O. Gaylord Marsh of the U. S. Consular Service in Yucatan, reported that the value of the henequen exported during the year 1917 was $34,959,937. The books of the *Comision Reguladora del Mercado de Henequen* show, for the fiscal year ending November 22, 1918, that the value of henequen exports amounted to fifty-nine million dollars, the highest amount ever received for one year's crop of sisal in Yucatan. The official statistics kept by the *Comision* show that the number of bales exported from Progreso increased steadily from 558,996 in 1910 to 1,191,433 in 1916, and that in 1918 it amounted to 798,862. But let us return to the article:

Recent arrivals in the United States say that the condition of the people is tragic; they are impoverished, demoralized, and desperate. They are taught to hate all who are more prosperous than themselves, and the restraints formerly exercised by the church have been removed, so that morality is at its lowest ebb, nor is any improvement in sight. The Bolshevist system is rapidly consuming the resources of the country, and the time is approaching when there will be nothing left to consume. Yucatan presents a picture of complete national degradation, with liberty overthrown, capital destroyed, industries slowly dying, education perverted, hatred and strife encouraged, robbery and murder rampant, the educated class exiled or murdered, and the laborers exploited and impoverished by rapacious despotism.

The facts are that the Yucatan laborer now receives a salary for specified hours of work; he is looked upon as a human being; he is organized on a coöperative basis and enjoys, just as the planter himself enjoys, a proportionate share of this stream of gold that comes into the State, and that does not leave in the hands of the middle-man in the United States a large part of its volume. The value of all articles imported into Yucatan during the year 1918, according to American figures, amounted to forty million dollars. An agricultural state with a single source of production and hardly any market other than the United States, that collects in an epoch of robbery, degradation, and tragedy thirty-nine million dollars in gold more than in its days of peace and prosperity, and imports about one hundred per cent. more during this period of decay than in its prime and golden epoch is indeed a strange state. The article continues:

The social system [of Yucatan] was feudal. Four hundred

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

owners held all the henequen land. No foreigner (and all born outside the boundaries of the State were considered such) had been allowed to acquire henequen properties. The laborers were Indians, many of whom were born, lived all their lives, and died on the same plantation. They were well paid, well fed, fat and smiling, and seemed well content with their simple lives. . . . The productive capital was concentrated in a few hands; labor was illiterate and docile; the Peninsula was so removed from the rest of the Republic that no interference was feared.

No one who knew the facts would assert that the Indians of Yucatan under the feudal plantation system were well paid, fat, and contented. Quite the reverse was true. Even occasional observers are familiar with the famous "debt system," the "garrote," the punishment by whip, the twelve-hour day, the child's labor on the farm without any right to education, the paternalism which invested the planter with the right over the body and property of his vassals, and many other features of this type which General Alvarado and his supporters wiped out once and forever from Yucatan, making every Indian laborer a free man, whom no other power on earth will be able to take back into slavery. The writer of the article considers it highly praiseworthy that a great many of those Indian laborers were born, lived all their lives, and died on the same plantation. On those plantations before Alvarado's time there were no schools or places of amusement. The laborer obtained from his masters, at the plantation shop, a coarse kind of liquor called "pixoy," made of cheap alcohol. Those who indulged heavily in this drink would frequently be affected by pellagra and leprosy, and would fall into debt to the plantation owner. As long as the laborer was thus in debt he could not go to another plantation to work. General Alvarado suppressed this debt system, and decreed that laborers were free to work wherever they pleased, that they had a right to demand wages for a specified number of hours' work, that their children had a right to attend school, and that no child should go to work on the plantations. In order to suppress the notorious evils caused by the liquor called "pixoy" in the Indian population, General Alvarado caused a law to be passed forbidding the manufacture and sale of liquor in the whole State of Yucatan.

The writer of the article I am commenting upon rises to the climax of his unsubstantiated utterances by saying that General Alvarado established in Yucatan the basic principle of Bolshevism, which ruled that all property, including women, belonged to the masses, and that the masses had the right to take them, using violence if necessary.

Here are a few facts that will show the utter falsity of that statement and reveal Alvarado's work in behalf of the women of Yucatan. He convoked and carried out a Congress in the City of Merida, in 1916, for the purpose of allowing women to discuss their own problems, principally in regard to home and children. He established the first vocational school for women in Merida, the first school of its kind ever known in Mexico. When Alvarado came to Yucatan, the whole State was a licensed resort, where many foreign women were engaged in white slave traffic. Prostitution was a business by which social parasites thrived, exploiting the inexperience of the younger planters. Alvarado exiled the women engaged in this traffic; he punished severely all forms of licentiousness; and he made no distinction among the offenders, whether they were rich or poor, friend or enemy. He started a campaign for the elevation of women that was without precedent either in Mexico or in any other Spanish-speaking country. He protected the women of the poorer class, making them free and respected in Yucatan, and giving them a legal place in the community which paternalism had denied them either within or without the church. You cannot go today to Yucatan and abuse any woman without making yourself liable to a substantial punishment. All the forces of the State are behind the sacredness of women. Alvarado did this work and nobody else before him ever dared to start it. He started it, challenging a whole army of feudalists and traditionalists, as well as the men in their pay.

Alvarado was not the keeper of a *cantina*, or saloon; and if his origin was humble, we cannot forget that one of the greatest of Americans was a railsplitter. He did not murder his opponents, confiscate their property, nor terrorize the entire population. On the contrary, he made life and property safe for every man who himself obeys the laws, and he chose, for the upbuilding of Yucatan, the ablest men that he could find, whether they were his opponents or his friends. There was no organization of the State on a Bolshevist basis. There were no political executions, and the educated people are not in exile or even in fear. They visit the United States at short intervals and they send their children here to school. Alvarado did not appoint Carlos Castro Morales Governor. He was elected at a general election by the plurality of votes cast, as in an election in the United States, according to law and the constitution.

These are a few of the grotesque statements contained in the article, and American readers may judge for themselves what really is the situation in Yucatan. I merely wish to remark in closing that erroneous information, both regarding Mexico and the United States, is very injurious to the mutual interests of both nations. The supplying of such misinformation is the kind of activity that makes for a decrease in the volume of business between the two countries, while European nations are every day improving their trade relations with Latin-America. We have frequently heard the question, "Why not increase our trade with Latin-America?" The first way to increase American trade with Latin-America is to understand her life and the aims of her people, who, in Yucatan at any rate, have the same fundamental conceptions of liberty and democracy as prevail in the United States. But evil unfortunately is more readily believed than good, and writings based on misinformation offset our great efforts to win the South American trade. The best way therefore to capture trade in Spanish-speaking countries is to demand that anybody who writes about any of them should take real pains to get accurate information.

Contributors to This Issue

GEORGE SEIBEL, a Pittsburgh newspaper man and sociologist, is the author of several books and plays.

ALICE EDGERTON, formerly investigator for the Federal Immigration Commission and Professor of Economics in Rockford College, is an occasional contributor to the leading reviews.

MANUEL CARPIO is the New York representative of *El Herald de Mexico* and special correspondent of *El Heraldo de Madrid.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pasturage

By MARIE EMILIE GILCHRIST

SOME day I am going to own an acre or so of rocky pasturage on the side of a hill in the Berkshires, and it will be high enough to let me see other hills ranging into the distance in greens and grays and purples, and low enough so that nearby hills will shelter me from winds. There will be a brook going through it, and a few trees scattered about—a ragged pine, and a clump of silver birches near the brook; a beech with low-hung branches; perhaps a maple or an elm, and a shag-bark hickory that will turn to gold in October. I shall clear away a few boulders and put up a small shack with a fireplace.

I shall withdraw to this hermitage when I find that my relations with humanity are becoming strained—in early spring—and stay until the white violets and bluets and arbutus tucked in between the lichened rocks have blossomed, and the cowslips by the brook have yielded their yellow gold. I shall watch my brook swell to a miniature torrent and then settle down to a silvery singing thing. I may even count the days that it takes for the fiddle-necked ferns to uncurl, and no one shall see the dogwood and shadbush dust the nearest hills with white sooner than I. When the silver birches re-feather the slopes with glad light green, I shall have time to rejoice in each rounded tuft of leaves against the sombre pines; and I shall know my hills at dawn and at dusk, when the spring rains are hanging veils of mystery before them, and when the air is so clear that the morning sun shows range upon range of blue pinnacles as I climb to the highest corner of my pasture lot. And then, when spring is no longer a sprite and a hoyden, but an obvious and sophisticated young lady, I shall lock up my cabin until I see the first buds on the golden-rod.

Then I shall go back to my pasture, to find purple morning-glories twisted about the dusty mullein-stalks, and Queen Anne's lace starring the rank grasses. When I walk up the slope the rounded silken globes of the dandelions will break as I brush past and drift away in downy feathers. A squirrel will probably leap chattering from the roof of the cabin into the beech-tree as I rattle the key in the lock. Blarney, my Irish setter, will chase a phantom woodchuck into the hole under the hickory and drink at the brook, now a subdued and tinkling thread of water crowded with mint. And after we have eaten, we shall sit in our doorway and watch the pageant of night as it comes in, to a quaint, piping ditty, and fire-flies will flash into trembling light among the birches.

Golden-rod and asters will muffle my gray old rocks now, and the hills will show different notes of scarlet and yellow and russet every day, while the farthest peaks will be almost hidden by the purple hazes of autumn. Perhaps I shall find a family of fringed gentians among my birches or on the opposite hills, when Blarney and I take an all-day ramble. The boulder fence will flaunt crimson woodbine and bittersweet in the sun. I shall harvest hickory-nuts and wintergreen berries for the squirrel, and see that my woodpile is well stocked with pine cones and bark for kindling. Only when the frost lays my asters low, and when the gold of my hickory is squandered for a rustling carpet, shall I say goodbye to the hills, and snap a leash upon the collar of the reluctant and wrigglesome Blarney. Too well do we know, he and I, the tug of the leash.

Foreign Correspondence

The Menace of Revolution

London, August 2

"THAT, in the opinion of this House, the times call for a revolution in the ideas at the basis of society." When such a resolution can be carried at the Oxford Union by 333 votes to 120, it is clear that the revolution it speaks of has already begun. When, too, a respectable publishing firm can advertise, without risk of being raided, its issue of a "Christian Revolution Series," edited by a Congregational minister, we may infer that the word itself is no longer quite the bogy that it used to be. Perhaps its definition will need to be revised in our next dictionaries. "Fundamental reconstruction, especially forcible substitution, by subjects, of new ruler or policy for the old"—that would serve fairly well as an account of most past revolutions; but we are now hearing a good deal of revolutions that are not to be political but economic, and that are to be effected not by violence but by pacific processes. Actually, however, while a political must be distinguished from an economic revolution, the two permit of a close connection. If, for instance, a soviet should supersede Parliament, the political change would be accomplished avowedly as a step toward the establishment of a new economic order.

The man in the street does not concern himself greatly just now about the idealist aspirations of university undergraduates or about the endeavors of theologians to apply the principles of the *Magnificat* to modern conditions. What makes him anxious is the apprehension of sudden and far-reaching disturbances accompanied by outrage and bloodshed. He is rather unnecessarily scared by the current talk about "direct action," i. e., the attempt of a powerful section of labor to gain its ends, political and economic alike, by downing tools. There is nothing very novel about this policy. In adopting it, labor will only be following the example set by capital. We have been told by Lord Inchcape that, at a critical moment in the war, the shipowners got their way with the Government by the threat to sell their ships to foreigners; and the mine-owners, speaking through Lord Gainford, have announced their intention of refusing to carry on their industry in the event of certain decisions by Parliament. Labor can further plead the argument that a strike, or the threat of one, is shown by recent experience to be the only method of securing fair treatment, or even of attracting attention to its grievances. It was by the use of this weapon, for instance, that not long ago 800,000 railway workers won the concession of an eight hours' day. And, in any case, "direct action" is only a form of passive resistance, like that of the Nonconformists who refused to pay local taxes for the support of denominational schools. Indeed, the attitude of the Free Church passive resisters was more revolutionary, in the ordinary sense of the word, for they deliberately defied the authority of the state, as a miner does not who simply refuses to hew coal for a private employer.

What is making so many people uneasy is the fear that the expression of discontent will not limit itself to a refusal to work, but will take aggressive and violent forms. We do not hear very much nowadays of the complacent theory, so popular a while ago, that the common struggle against Germany had welded the nation together, and especially

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA, OHIO

that "the comradeship of the trenches" had broken down all class feeling forevermore. *The Daily Graphic*, it is true, as late as Derby Day, drew optimistic conclusions from the "cheery commingling of almost every type of individual character" on Epsom Downs, but this notion of an era of good feeling resulting from the sharing of the most frightful experiences of the war is now generally recognized as an illusion. More solid grounds for confidence are sought for today. We are reminded that the English temperament is averse to violent changes. Ours is a sober freedom, which slowly "broadens down from precedent to precedent." There is nothing here of "the red fool-fury of the Seine" —or of the Neva, as a contemporary poet would doubtless have put it, if the laws of metre allowed. The Englishman is, above all things, practical. When Continental countries have been in turmoil through conflicts over abstractions like equality and democracy, he has kept his head, and has sensibly devoted himself to regular and peaceful movements toward some definite and reasonable object. Trade unionism, on the whole, has been a conservative force, and the working man is shrewd enough to see that he will only make his condition worse by revolutionary agitation. Then, again, this country possesses a steadying force in her large middle class, which has no sympathy with hotheads and may be trusted to interpose a dead weight of inertia, if nothing else, in the way of an attempt at sudden upheaval. If there had only been a large middle-class element in Russia, how different her recent history might have been!

All this is very comforting—if only you can forget that there has been such a thing as the great war. The fact is that scarcely any generalizations on such subjects that were valid five years ago are worth anything today. The precedent-to-precedent method of advance is dead and buried. In political affairs we are now accustomed to fundamental and far-reaching changes accomplished overnight. We have had women's franchise and universal suffrage brought in suddenly without any consultation of the electorate. The traditional cabinet system has been scrapped by a mere fiat of the Prime Minister. Further, the war has made the use of military weapons familiar to a large proportion of the manhood of the country. It has been noted that, in the past, *émeutes* in Paris have been much more deadly than riots in London because Frenchmen have known how to fight and to form barricades. Henceforth every English mob will include some military experts. By the Military Service Act, the Government imprisoned the very men who would have exerted a pacific influence when trouble arose, with the result, in many instances, of so impairing their health as to destroy their capacity for leadership, while it has trained the wilder spirits in the use of arms. The middle classes, so far from being a barrier against sedition, are scarcely less discontented than the industrial, and many among them are being driven to the conclusion that they have as little to lose as anybody by an upheaval. There must further be taken into account the effect of recent events on the Continent. Stupid people lay the blame of disaffection to the activities of some "hidden hand" that has been corrupting simple-minded folk by foreign money. During the war it was German gold that was doing the mischief. Now, of course, it is Russian gold that is seducing the British proletariat. The guardians of the established order would get much nearer the root of the trouble, in so far as it is of alien origin, if they could enforce an embargo on foreign ideas. But you cannot quarantine an atmosphere.

When Lenin was discussing this subject with Arthur Ransome, he maintained that the microbe of revolution had already found lodgment in England. There is a good deal to confirm his diagnosis. A brisk business is now being done at Lloyd's in insurance against loss or damage by riot and civil commotion. The Luton incident offers a grave warning. Luton is no Paterson or Butte. This quiet Bedfordshire town is one of the last places from which one would expect any disorderly outbreak. But on the evening of the peace celebrations an uncontrollable mob burnt down the Luton town hall—the first instance, it is said, of any public building meeting such a fate since the Reform Bill riots at Bristol in 1831. What has happened at Luton might happen anywhere, given the necessary provocation. Suppose that in any English town to-day, large or small, you collected the demobilized soldiers who are sore because of the treatment they received in the army or the difficulty they find in getting employment now that they are out of it; the friends of men who are still retained with the colors against their will, while others have been released from service; the friends of men whom the tribunals compelled to join up, while others, with no better claim to exemption, were excused and allowed to obtain war work at home at high wages; the widows and dependents who have been jockeyed out of pensions or allowances, or who have suffered from delays and inequalities of payment; the families that have had to go short in the necessaries of life while profiteers have flourished; and the people who are compelled to herd in congested quarters for lack of available houses. You would then have a substantial crowd consisting of inflammable material that needed only the application of a spark to produce an explosion. There was never a war before that inflicted such a nervous strain, whether upon those who fought in it or those who stayed at home, or that left behind it so deep and widespread a sense of grievance against the constituted authorities. It is not too much to say that the whole nation is seething with unrest. No doubt, it is true that very few in this great multitude have anything like a clear-cut programme of changes that they would like to see brought about. Most of them take little interest in the resolutions passed by Labor party conferences or trade union congresses. All that they are determined upon as yet is that things have got to be altered somehow. But they provide a powerful body to which an effective appeal might be made by adroit leaders who know their own minds and have set very distinct objects before themselves. A comparatively small group might easily utilize this dangerous situation for its own purposes. As long ago as 1908, Lord Rosebery, referring to the fact that the socialists were in a minority, said: "The lesson of history, written on every page, is that revolutions are made, not by a majority, but by a minority—an earnest, violent if you like, minority, but still a minority." He reminded his hearers that the Puritans in the revolution which overthrew the throne and beheaded Charles were not a majority of the nation, nor were those who overthrew the throne of France and took the life of Louis XVI. He might, perhaps, have added to his list of illustrative examples. Whether British history is to supply yet further instances will depend mainly upon the discretion of those who today sit in the seats of the mighty.

HERBERT W. HORWILL

[Mr. Horwill's letter, although considerably delayed in publication, is so applicable to recent events, that *The Nation* prints it for its interpretative value.—EDITOR'S NOTE.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On a Contemporary Anthology

By MARGARET WIDDEMER

VERY staid they lie between
These their sober covers—
On a page my enemies,
On a page my lovers.

This that sings a song of saints
All austere and pious—
Ah, he drank their healths too deep
On a night hard by us!

Here's a lady cries on Pan—
Dear and courteous Quaker—
What her horror, if the god,
Mannerless, should take her!

And this prayerful song of fire,
Song of faith unbroken—
Oh, alas, that it should be
Many a lady's token!

Ah, but I shall never tell.
See, I close the covers.
I am mute, my enemies;
Rest untold, my lovers!

In the Driftway

THE Drifter keeps hoping that he may hear of some great painter risen in Jugoslavia or Czecho-Slovakia (or some other well-advertised country) to vie in publicity with Paderewski and d'Annunzio. Then the sister arts might contend again for a judgment of Paris. So far the Drifter, were he intrusted with the bestowal of the golden apple, would be in favor of Poetry. Music has certainly dealt unfairly by the world in assuming the mute and sullen domino of diplomacy. But Poetry! What melodramas are being carved on the Dalmatian coast! Rarely does it fall to the lot of a playwright to be his own hero, his own villain, and his own producer, and to stage the Adriatic as a tank drama. When, in addition to such scope for artistic temperament, one has international right of way with no speed limit (and a national "angel" tucked snugly in the Boot), it is evident that the movie is outdone and Poetry's banner will henceforth lead the adventurous. Music, indeed, to make herself heard, will have to quicken the courtly minuet to a ragged jazz (or is it a jagged razz?—the Drifter is in doubt). Come, Painting, and fling your crudest color-pots abroad!

* * * * *

MEANWHILE the three-wise-men-in-a-bowl float round and round, making no port. The newspapers report that one of the three recently "passed a restless night." It would seem to the Drifter that navigators on such unchancy seas might pass many restless nights. And what of the people on shore? They see the clumsy craft threatening and threatened; they repeat to themselves "If the bowl had been stronger the tale had been longer," and turn to other leaders. Were the three wise men not already befogged they might see who these leaders are: not statesmen or worldly wise diplomats, but masters of the arts that reach men's souls. It is the singers and not the debaters, the poets and not the writers of treaties, the painters and not the makers of maps that know the world as it is and as it shall be. Of these an occasional one, though gifted with divine fire and unmindful of the fate of Phaethon, may still drive ambition's car; but the meteor does not lessen our enjoyment of the stars.

* * * * *

SAMSON'S words, "Out of the strong came forth sweetness," rang through the Drifter's head as he talked with a Russian friend just back from Siberia. In the days of Old Russia he knew her as a revolutionist, a burning spirit to whom bombs were as beacon lights to liberty. In her girlhood she had played her part in terror, in imprisonment, and in exile, and her zeal had not been quenched. But it was in the Drifter's garden that she first came to know the constructive value of destruction. The Drifter had dreams of converting his stony hilltop into an orchard, and the digging that his spade refused he accomplished speedily with dynamite. At each shock his dark-eyed guest again lived through the horror her own hand had wrought; it was a daily miracle to her to see the power of violence thus turned husbandman, with life to follow its might. Then came the Russian Revolution, and the exile, free of the sword so long hung over her, hastened homeward. This time no bombs were in her satchel, but she carried her baby in her arms and the love of children in her heart.

* * * * *

FOR two years, while the Drifter's morning paper has blazoned Bolshevist atrocities, his friend has gone from city to city in Siberia, establishing Montessori schools. The Drifter likes to picture the young girls clustered round her, learning to transmute visions into realities; he watches the kindling faces of the soldiers' orphans; he sees mothers bringing to the school the black loaf and the bowl of milk their poverty affords; he realizes that the peasants and the townsfolk are seeking a new world for their children. For most groups the day of violence has passed; the ground broken by revolution is springing with hope. Indeed, the Drifter wishes that his apple trees were doing as well.

* * * * *

FROM various letters and informal accounts the Drifter begins to understand why John Drinkwater's "Lincoln" still holds its audiences in a suburban theatre to which London would not travel nightly for ordinary entertainment. The secret of the play lies in the close and tender analogy between that long war and this which Mr. Drinkwater has hinted at in every scene. And it is not merely endurance which the play throws light upon—it is peace and reconciliation as well. Mr. Drinkwater has drawn a four-year's thread of suffering and hatred through the very fine needle of malice toward none and charity for all. London, recovering from its debauch of bitterness, is soothing itself with such draughts. Lincoln's denunciation of Mrs. Goliath Blow in the third scene is a moving symbol of the triumph of gentleness and magnanimity over the sort of tribal violence and moral confusion which war begets and cherishes. The most astonishing thing about it is that that insular race at so important a time should have found its symbol not in its own history but in ours. Spiritually the fact dims a thousand schemes for an Anglo-American entente. THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

Lessons from Ibsen

WE relegate Ibsen to dim places. But he himself would, no doubt, have felt more at home on Grand Street in the Neighborhood Playhouse, facing a shadowy little Old World square, than under the harsh glitter of Broadway. To Grand Street, at all events, we must go to see the only Ibsen performances in America—the only ones, probably, for a long time. The trip is worth while, not because it will be rewarded by a flawless artistic pleasure. Let it be rather in the nature of a discipline of the mind, a cleansing of the perceptions. The opportunities for such discipline and such cleansing are as rare as they are sorely needed. From Grand Street one carries away a fortifying confirmation of two basic truths concerning the art of the theatre.

The British company that begins its New York engagement with "Hedda Gabler" is not, as a whole, remarkable. Miss Octavia Kenmore may once have shone as Hedda; she can hope to do so no longer. Mr. Leigh Lovel accentuates the pathos of theatrical careers prolonged beyond their proper periods. The associates of these two are not more than adequate, except one. But that one makes up for the shortcomings of the others. If one could only fill a few autobuses with commercial managers who think they know how to cast a play, and with the evening stars of the profession, and transport them to the front rows of the Grand Street theatre to see Mr. Albert Bruning as George Tesman!

Mr. Bruning is not a really great actor. But he is an admirable exponent of the art of realistic acting, and so of vital importance as a clarifying example of the actor's art. On our stage the practice of that art is confused and darkened by an absurd distinction. There are supposed to be actors and—"character actors." There are beautiful and graceful and accomplished persons who display themselves through some negligible medium to envious and adoring admirers; there are the artists who work hard to create human values under the ribs of current plays. The latter are the character actors. There are, in other words, Jane Cowl and Ruth Chatterton and the male matinée idols; and there are also, let us say, Whitford Kane and Beryl Mercer and Ferdinand Gottschalk. Thousands have heard of the former group; a mere handful appreciates the latter. Yet these are the only true actors, since they alone seek a complete submersion in the people whom the dramatist has bidden them to body forth. But the more perfect their art grows, the more does it withdraw them from the gaze of that huge public which goes not to see a play by a certain author and to be delighted if the interpretation is good, but primarily to see Miss Chatterton's smile (an enchanting smile, be it granted) whether that smile gleams from "Daddy Longlegs" or from "Moonlight and Honeysuckle" (Henry Miller's Theatre).

Mr. Bruning does not act George Tesman; he has become George Tesman. Under the guidance of Ibsen he has conceived the character coherently from within; he has then created the visible embodiment of that simple, admirable, absurd soul. His strong and disciplined imagination has worked out in detail those traits of Tesman that externalize the inner man. These he has made his own. His Tesman is both the "dear boy" of Aunt Julia and the maddening simpleton he seems to the neurasthenic Hedda—a kindly, honorable, simple-hearted gentleman; a pedant and a bore. Nothing is more characteristic of Mr. Bruning's work, nothing more important for our actors to observe, than his way of treating simple speech. Such speech, as everyone knows, never consists solely of perfectly articulated words. But the playwright cannot transcribe—though it has been attempted—those inarticulate noises that accompany and run through all human talk. The actor should supply them. Watch Mr. Bruning as he sits beside the fire in the grim, jaded light of early morning and tells Hedda the story of Ejlert's desperate relapse. Those little shudderings and stutterings, those stifled yawns, that weariness and eagerness of imperfect speech! But it is the austerity of Ibsen's art which, after all, makes such acting possible. What, with all the talent and insight in the world, can Whitford Kane do with the sentimentalized carpenter in "Tiger, Tiger" (The Montauk Theatre), or Ferdinand Gottschalk with the equally sentimentalized Uncle Horace in "Adam and Eva" (The Longacre Theatre)? The actor cannot exercise his true art upon puppets. He needs men. "Stars" are created by plays that have no characters and then tend to perpetuate the evil from which they are born. And that is the first of the basic truths that a visit to Grand Street will fortify and confirm in any one who can think at all.

The play itself, "Hedda Gabler," is not one of Ibsen's first-rate achievements. Hedda, in herself, is immensely real. But the case of that spiritual snob and shrew is never wholly lifted above its very special character. The great protagonists of naturalistic art, from Tom Jones to Drayman Henschel, are intensely concrete and eternally human at the same time. Hedda is never quite the latter. But what one carries away from the whole performance is, once more, a sense of the supreme honesty of a great dramatist's mind. Here is a growth and no mere concatenation of events. Ibsen gives us glimpses of Hedda's and of Tesman's past; he imparts to us a conviction of the necessities of their being and their action. Out of those necessities the situation arises; upon them the structure of the play is built. If there is any swerving in the course of its dramatic culmination, it was never Ibsen's will that permitted such a swerving to take place. The difference between a great dramatist and a small playwright is not alone, is not perhaps primarily, a difference in talent, but a difference in men's will to truth.

Apply the test of intellectual honesty to Mr. Buchanan's new and popularly successful comedy "Civilian Clothes" (The Morosco Theatre). A young, romantic, wealthy Southern girl, during the emotional ardor of war work in France, was swept off her feet and married on the spot by an heroic and decorated captain of infantry. After a week's honeymoon the captain goes into action and is reported killed. Florence Lanham returns to her home and is there suddenly sought and claimed by her husband, who had merely lost his identification tag and has now recovered from his wounds. And this husband is no longer an heroic figure between two flames of battle. He is merely Sam McGinnis—a person with yellow shoes and "nifty" clothes and appropriate speech and manners. Here, if we grant Mr. Buchanan the incident of the captain's return, is a situation that holds a conflict not only between individuals, but between two sets of social implications—a situation that might have grown into a searching study of American life, of the spiritual import of those manners that so deeply divide class from class. Having the ability to conceive this situation and to present it so clearly and credibly, one would have expected Mr. Buchanan to deal with one or two of its obvious dramatic values. He does nothing of the sort. He acts precisely as though in art there were no such thing as common honesty or reasonable continuity. McGinnis becomes butler in the Lanham household and acquires a butler's polish. That is supposed to solve the deeper problem. He also turns out to be a distinguished engineer who can earn twenty-five thousand a year. At any price Florence must be made happy with her Sam and the public must leave the playhouse with the conviction that there are no classes and no oppositions within society, and that life, in fact, holds no difficulties that young love and manly vigor and general romantic muddle-headedness cannot cure out of hand. Such dramatic writing is not, first of all, bad artistically. As art it has not begun to exist. And that is so because it is intellectually dishonest. A good playwright must have integrity of mind. And that is the second lesson of Ibsen. Are both of the lessons mere platitudes? Ah, if they only were! Today, at least, the platitudes of art are the red heresies of Broadway.

L. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books of the Week

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Aronovici, Carol. Americanization. St. Paul, Minn.: Keller Publishing Co.—Maxey, Chester C. County Administration. Macmillan. $2.50.—Rightor, Chester E. City Manager in Dayton. Macmillan. $2.50.—Smith, Reginald Heber. Justice and the Poor. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.—Walston (Waldstein), Sir Charles. The English-Speaking Brotherhood and the League of Nations. Columbia University Press.

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Ellsworth, William W. A Golden Age of Authors. Houghton Mifflin. $3.75.—Hearn, Lafcadio. Fantastics, and Other Fancies. Houghton Mifflin. $1.65.—Jenkins, MacGregor. Literature with a Large L. Houghton Mifflin. $1.—Seibel, George. Bacon versus Shakespeare. Pittsburgh: Lessing Co.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Brown, P. Hume. Surveys of Scottish History. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons.—Dinsmore, Charles A. Life of Dante Alighieri. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50.—McGrane, Reginald (editor). The Correspondence of Nicholas Biddle. Houghton Mifflin. $6.—Morison, J. L. British Supremacy and Canadian Self-Government, 1839-1854. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons.—Seitz, Don C. Artemus Ward. Harpers. $2.—Sewall, William W. Bill Sewall's Story of T. R. Harpers. $1.25.—Thayer, William Roscoe. Theodore Roosevelt. Houghton, Mifflin. $5.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Lowell, Amy. Pictures of the Floating World. Macmillan. $1.50.—Sargent, Frederick LeRoy. Omar and the Rabbi. Four Seas. 75 cents.—Shaw, Bernard. Heartbreak House, Great Catherine, and Playlets of the War. Brentano. $1.75.

FICTION

Aumonier, Stacy. The Querrils. Century. $1.60.—Bacon, Josephine D. Square Peggy. Appleton. $1.60.—Bassett, Sara W. The Harbor Road. Penn Publishing Co. $1.50.—Belasco, David. (Louis V. Defoe, editor.) The Theatre Through its Stage Door. Harpers. $2.50.—Gregory, Sacha. Yellowleaf. Lippincott. $1.50.—Orczy, Baroness. The League of the Scarlet Pimpernel. Doran. $1.60.—Safroni-Middleton, A. Gabrielle of the Lagoon. Lippincott. $1.50.—Tallentyre, S. G. Love Laughs Last. Doran. $1.75.—Thurston, E. Temple. The World of Wonderful Reality. Appleton. $1.75.—Walton, George L. Oscar Montague: Paranoiac. Lippincott. $1.50.

THE WAR

Fried, Alfred H. Mein Kreigs-Tagebuch. Das zweite Griegsjahr. Zurich: Max Rascher Verlag.—Gibbs, A Hamilton. Gun Fodder. Little, Brown. $2.—Hansen, Ferdinand. An Open Letter to an English Officer and Incidentally to the English People. Hamburg.—Peixotto, Ernest. The American Front. Scribners. $3.50.—Russia's Mobilization for the World War. Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sons.—Streeter, Edward. Love Letters of Bill to Mable [complete]. Houghton Mifflin. $1.60.—The War Cabinet. Report for the Year 1918. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Denis, Léon. Life and Destiny. Translated by Ella Wheeler Wilcox. Doran.—English, John Mahan. For Pulpit and Platform. Macmillan. $1.25.—Latourette, Kenneth Scott. The Christian Basis of World Democracy. Association Press. $1.—Morgenstern, Julian. A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis. Cincinnati: Department of Synagogue and School Extension.

JUVENILE

Barbour, Ralph Henry. The Play that Won. Appleton. $1.50.—Burgess, Thornton W. The Burgess Bird Book for Children. Little, Brown. $2.50.—Ernst, Clayton H. Blind Trails. Little, Brown. $1.50.—Gate, Ethel May. Tales from the Secret Kingdom. Yale University Press. $2.—Irwin, Inez Haynes. The Happy Years. Holt. $1.60.—John Martin's Big Book for Little Folk, Number Three. Houghton Mifflin.—Pyle, Katharine. Tales of Folk and Fairies. Little, Brown. $1.60.—Spyri, Johanna. Heidi. Translated by Elizabeth P. Stork. Lippincott. $2.50.—Townsend, Ralph M. A Journey to the Garden Gate. Houghton Mifflin. $2.—Widdemer, Margaret. Winona's Way. Lippincott. $1.35.

Burton, Charles P. The Trail Makers. Holt. $1.50.

Collins, A. Frederick. The Boys' Airplane Book. Stokes. $1.50.

Mullett, George M. Betsy Lane, Patriot. Century. $1.25.

Seaman, Augusta H. The Slipper Point Mystery. Century. $1.35.

ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Ferguson, John C. Outlines of Chinese Art. University of Chicago Press. $3.—Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Volume One. School of Classical Studies, 1915-1916. New York: University Press Association.

Herford, Mary A. B. A Handbook of Greek Vase Painting. Longmans, Green. $3.75.

MISCELLANEOUS

Cleland, Ethel. Five Hundred Business Books. Washington, D. C.: American Library Association.—Goebel, Julius (editor). Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Lllinois, 1917. University of Chicago Perss.

Hoerle, Helen Christene, and Saltzberg, Florence B. The Girl and the Job. Holt. $1.50.

NATURE AND OUTDOOR LIFE

Chapman, William G. Green-Timber Trails. Century. $1.60.

Carroll, Dixie. Fishing, Tackle and Kits. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd. $2.

Fabre, Jean H. Field, Forest and Farm. Century. $2.

Footner, Hulbert. New Rivers of the North. Doran. $2.

"A vivid narrative of mighty reactions"
says HORACE TRAUBEL of
THE PROTESTANT
By BURRIS A. JENKINS
The author calls it "A scrap-book for insurgents." Dr. Jenkins, Kansas City's leading minister and editor of the Kansas City Post, believes in the church, but he flames with wrath at the hypocrisy and weakness of conventional church life. He demands a new leadership to bring the church out from the autocracy of Protestantism into the freedom of the new day. $1.35, plus 10 cents postage.
THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY PRESS
716 East 40th Street *CHICAGO, ILLINOIS*

Whatever book you want
Wanamaker's
has it, or will get it.
We buy old, rare books, and sets of books
NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation
International Relations Section

Contents

BRITISH POLICY IN THE EAST
By W. P. Crozier.....503
THE BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION OF KOREA
By Rae D. Henkle.....505
DOCUMENTS: The British-Persian Treaty—The Kaiser and the Austrian Ultimatum..... 507
FOREIGN PRESS: Mr. Brailsford on the Persian Treaty —A French Point of View..... 509

British Policy in the East

By W. P. CROZIER

IN an article printed recently by *The Nation* I was allowed to point out that British policy with regard to Russia was incompletely understood because it was treated as though its roots lay only in the affairs of Europe. England, it is said, is supporting the Russian, as a century ago she supported the French, émigrés against the Revolution. Or, England is backing the financial and political plans of the French Foreign Office; she aims at the recovery of Russia's foreign debt, and at erecting again in Eastern Europe a counterpoise to the revived Germany which France fears. Whatever truth there may be in these explanations, they do not sufficiently cover the ground. Russia was and England still is an Imperial and an Eastern Power. Their Asiatic Empires did not actually march together, but they were only separated by a chain of weak or dependent states across which the two Powers eyed each other with jealousy and suspicion.

For generations British policy, guided by the India and the Foreign Offices, has been largely directed by the desire to protect the British Eastern Empire, stretching from Egypt to India and on to the Straits Settlements and China, against the encroachments of other Imperialist Powers. The Anglo-Japanese treaty, whoever originally proposed it, was calculated, in the conception of the British Foreign Office, to set back Russia from the northern frontiers of China, against which she had steadily been pressing since her occupation of Port Arthur, and in its revised form it contained specific provisions by which Japan was called on to assist in maintaining the security of India. The Anglo-French treaty of 1904 contained clauses which recognized and solidified the British hold on Egypt. The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 was an attempt by amicable means to stave off the approach of Russia to the borders of India through Persia and Afghanistan. As it happened, it was a misfire, for the Amir refused to assent to the Afghan clauses of the treaty, and the Russians used their hold over England as a means to tighten their grip on northern Persia. The British motive, however, was unmistakable. Even the convention with Germany which had been initialled in London in 1914 not long before the war broke out was governed in its Asiatic portions by the same general idea, for while it recognized Germany's interest in the western and central portions of the Bagdad railway, it left in the hands of England the last section, at the head of the Persian Gulf—or, in other words, the pathway which led to India. Now comes the new convention between England and Persia, which exhibits British policy once more moved by the same fundamental idea, sleeplessly watching the security of the Eastern Empire and taking advantage of the overthrow of its old enemies to build up fresh barriers against their recovery or the apparition of others in their place.

This watchfulness is not in itself an unworthy motive, provided that two conditions are fulfilled. The first is that it should not be practiced to the injury of other nations, small or great, which lie outside the British Eastern Empire. When an Imperialist Power takes to establishing protectorates or semi-protectorates, even if its original motives be unselfish, as they seldom are, it lies under a strong temptation (to which it usually succumbs) to use its opportunities in its own interest to the exclusion of the rest of the world, and at the same time permanently to infringe upon the national rights and independence of its protégés. The second condition is that a liberal and generous policy must be pursued within the bounds of the Empire which the British Government protects with an ever increasing ring of safeguards. These are conditions which Liberals everywhere should demand, and upon which all Englishmen should insist who are jealous for justice and the good name of their country.

It is not infrequently alleged that England has taken the opportunity of the war to build up a new Empire in the Middle East. Egypt has been cut off root and branch from Turkey. The southern Arabs are not, indeed, under a British protectorate, for their religious exclusiveness effectually safeguards them, but they owe not a little to the help which England has given them, and they are no longer under the Turk, or a possible instrument of aggression in his hands. Palestine is in British possession, and the French complain that the British, not content with even so handsome a measure of the spoils, would like to join to Palestine certain northern districts of Syria which, by one of the agreements made during the war, are covenanted to France. Palestine reaches across to Mesopotamia, and there again the British are installed and, under the expected "mandate," will remain. If we climb up to the high plateau on the Mesopotamian border, we are in Persia, where England has now established herself in a privileged and exclusive position which French critics bluntly call a protectorate. Beyond Persia again lie the trans-Caspian regions of Asiatic Russia where British troops, although in small numbers, are carry-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing on active operations against the Bolsheviki. There is nothing quite like this ubiquitous activity, partly military and partly diplomatic, which labors unceasingly from the borders of Tripoli to Bokhara, Samarcand, and the confines of China. Somewhere at the bottom of it all there is a plan, but it is not quite the plan which the French attribute to the British.

Every country has its megalomanics, but there are very few responsible people in England who have any desire to increase the Eastern Empire for the sake of adding to Britain's expensive "prestige." This is true of the Government of India, which, though it starts with anxiety at the merest whisper of trouble in the north, has for many years sought to avoid increasing its responsibilities along the border. Even in the case of the Tibetan expedition, which it undertook because of its inveterate dread of Russia, the Indian Government refused to entangle itself permanently in Tibetan affairs, and Sir Francis Younghusband was severely rebuked for attempting to go beyond his orders. Similarly, although the Amir in 1907 refused pointblank to accept the Anglo-Russian Convention, the design of the India Government was at bottom self-protective; it wanted to cut the Amir off from relations with Russia which might threaten danger to India in the future; only unfortunately the Amir was not disposed to undertake a self-denying ordinance for the benefit of people who had not taken the trouble to consult him before they framed it for him.

The public opinion of the world has naturally concentrated itself on Europe, but the critic should place himself for a moment in the seat of the Government of India. The entry of Turkey into the war created a new world. Egypt, which the Germans called "the neck of the British Empire," was weakly defended, and had the Turks been a people of "push and go," an invasion might easily have been successful. As it was, they twice crossed the Sinai desert to the Suez Canal. On the other side of their Empire, they invaded Persia and stretched out hands to their kinsmen in Central Asia. The question, therefore, for the British Government in India was what should be done with the Turkish territories through which armies had marched, and might march again, against Egypt and towards the confines of India. In the upshot, Palestine is promised to the Jews under British protection. We need make no claim to altruism in this respect, for it is obvious that a strong Jewish Palestine will be an effectual bastion to Egypt, but equally this arrangement scarcely justifies a charge of selfish Imperialism against the British Government; a purely acquisitive power would not have spontaneously agreed to make Palestine a "national home" for the Jews or any other beneficiaries except its own merchants and officials.

The intermediate link between Palestine and Mesopotamia consists of the independent Arab state whose boundaries are causing so much anxiety in Paris. For the British, boundaries apart, it is a comparatively simple problem. The Arabs are relieved from the Turks, they are to be independent, and if they can coalesce into a single state standing on its own feet and keeping its internal peace, England will be well satisfied, though perhaps a little surprised. Mesopotamia is more difficult. It is on the flank of Persia, through which lies one road to India, and it is agreed that it should pass finally from the Turks. To whom, then, should it go? An American "mandate" has been informally canvassed here for Mesopotamia, just as it has been for Palestine, for Persia and for Armenia, but that apparently is not to be hoped for, and the mandate is expected to go to England. If it does, it will be accepted as part of the defensive belt of which Palestine and the Arab state are the western wing. It is not a responsibility about which anyone in this country is enthusiastic, nor is the Government of India reported to desire it. For Mesopotamia, if it be administered by the British, will be a heavy burden on India. It is not a white man's land and the troops will have to be Indians. But the Government of India does not want to employ Indian troops outside India, for that raises delicate political issues within India itself. Nor does it want the expense, for even if Mesopotamia was once the Garden of Eden, it will not grow even cabbages today without a heavy outlay, which India cannot afford. Nor can England afford it. Mesopotamia will be another liability accepted, whether rightly or wrongly, on behalf of Indian defence, a link in the chain of outworks forged because the Government of India is fearful of the gap which has been made by Turkey's collapse.

But the Indian outlook, transformed already by Turkey's entrance into the war, was doubly changed by the Russian revolution. For the time the old Imperialist Russia disappeared. At one stroke Russian influence in Persia was destroyed. At the same time the Allies were steadily backing the Kolchaks and Denikins, whose success meant the revival of the old Imperialist Russia. The Government of India saw what it regarded as a danger and saw also its opportunity. The result is a convention under which England becomes the guide, protector, and furnisher of munitions to Persia to the exclusion of all other Powers, and Persia takes her place in the chain of outposts constructed for the defence of England's Eastern Empire.

The convention gives rise to some sharp questionings. Did Persia really desire this treaty and is there any national demand for it? We know that Persia sent delegates to Paris to seek a hearing before the Peace Conference, a formal recognition of Persia's independence, and the abrogation by England of the Anglo-Russian Convention. In none of these things was she successful, thanks to the opposition of the British Foreign Office. Is there anything to distinguish the convention from many similar instruments which have ended in the establishment of plain protectorates? If it be true that Persia needs money and advisers in order that she may stand on her own feet, would she have chosen to put herself in the hands of a single Power and one so directly interested rather than in the hands of disinterested and more "neutral" Powers? Would it not have been much better to allow—and advise—Persia to put herself in the hands of the League of Nations, which would have obtained both advisers and loans for her and would have safeguarded her independence and integrity against all comers? Would not that course have been at once the best protection for India and a much surer safeguard of peace than an exclusive agreement which will arouse resentment among Persian Nationalists, and jealousy among England's rivals? And when the time comes that Persia can stand alone upon her feet, will England, whose only genuine interest is a strong and independent Persia, consent to give up her privileged position? In a word, does this convention belong to the old world of diplomacy which we know so well and bitterly or to the new world which we were promised?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Benevolent Assimilation of Korea

By RAE D. HENKLE

"THERE are only two ways of colonial administration," an influential Japanese official said to me a few months ago. "One is to rule over the people as aliens. The English do that in India; therefore the Indian Empire cannot endure. You do it in a somewhat similar way in the Philippines. So the Philippines, perhaps in the near future, will pass out of your hands. The second way is to absorb the people. That is what we do. The Korean people will be absorbed by the Japanese. We teach them our language, establish our institutions, and make them one with us." That is the benevolent, Japanese method of colonization. It was the way Germany Germanized Alsace-Lorraine and Posen. It was the way Austria nationalized Bohemia, Transylvania, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. But Japan has consistently refused in Formosa, in China, in Korea, and in Manchuria to learn a primary lesson in governmental psychology: that a nation's language, its customs, its religion, its ideals, its ambitions cannot be legislated away. Even less can they be crushed under the butt of a rifle or cut away by the blade of a sabre. The result of all such attempts is inevitably unrest, intrigue, and revolt. Korea is now refusing to be "assimilated" or "absorbed," and Japan is endeavoring by the use of some 125,000 soldiers, steadily reinforced, to compel the process of assimilation.

The Korean revolution is unique in national movements in that it is what its leaders declare it, a passive revolution. Disorders on the part of the native population have been almost entirely lacking, and their protest against an alien rule has taken the form of a refusal to have business, official, or social contact with the Japanese. It cannot take on an armed aspect for the reason that there are neither arms nor ammunition in the peninsula except in the hands of the Government, and so close a watch is kept on the gateways to the country that none could possibly be smuggled in. A remarkable degree of shrewdness has been exhibited in the organization of the revolt, and especially in the phase of non-resistance, for it has served from the first to put Japan on the defensive before the world. We have the spectacle of a military machine, which, with the elimination of Germany, is the most complete in existence, ruthlessly killing unarmed men and women, not because they have risen against a government which they thoroughly distrust, but because they refuse to recognize Japanese rule. The leaders of the revolution have learned valuable lessons from two preceding revolts which were crushed almost at their inception. They have not put all their eggs into one basket; in other words, their plan is cumulative, but still passive, uprising. It involves only small parts of the population at any one time, and this device will enable them, in the face of the most rigorous methods of suppression, to extend their protest over a year or more. The loyalty with which the people are obeying orders and following implicitly the instructions of their leaders indicates an unsuspected sense of responsibility.

Korea was the last of the oriental nations to open its doors to civilization. Japan and China had felt the inexorable demand of the Occident for commercial relations and in the end gave up their policy of isolation. Korea managed to remain apart while she was nominally under Chinese suzerainty, but in 1875 Japan induced her to make a treaty as a separate, independent kingdom. Immediately, the Tokio Government sought to exercise a controlling influence over her by reason of the fact that three hundred years before, Japanese warriors had partly held the country for some seven years; but the effort was abandoned for the moment because of the increasing pressure from China and the expense of constant expeditions to the peninsula. The year after the formal secession of Korea from China, however, Japanese agents appeared, with two war-ships and three transports, and sent word to Seoul that they were there to make war or peace. The Korean emperor signed a treaty admitting the Japanese to trade relations, by this act ending his career as the ruler of a Hermit Kingdom, and opening the country to what proved to be the very uncertain advantages of civilization. Almost at once Korea became an international football, with Japan, China, and Russia kicking her about. As early as 1884 there were clashes between Japan and China that almost led to war, but the former at that time did not feel strong enough to undertake military operations against her huge neighbor. There was no lessening of rivalry, however, and no easing of the tension until, in 1894, the break came and Korea was the prize. The Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed April 14, 1895, bound China to agree to the complete independence of Korea.

The years 1894 and 1895 marked a real crisis in Japanese history from the standpoint of diplomacy, militarism, and economics. The war between the small island and the great empire was a surprising revelation to occidental peoples of the dotage of China, on the one hand, and the ascendancy of Japan on the other. At that time the Japanese were high in favor with the Korean Government, but the Tokio representatives were in too great haste to reap the fruits of their victory over China, and their attitude in Seoul, where they assumed the rôle of master and dictator, quickly alienated the Koreans and gave an opportunity to Russia to win a dominant position at the court. Here, ten years before it started, was engendered the Russo-Japanese war, in which Japan was victorious, and a month after the Treaty of Portsmouth, she signed a treaty with England containing a significant reference to Korea. Article 3 of this agreement reads:

> Japan possessing paramount political, military, and economic interests in Korea, Great Britain recognizes the right of Japan to take *such measures of guidance, control, and protection* in Korea as she may deem proper and necessary to safeguard and advance those interests, provided always that such measures are not contrary to the principles of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations.

Intelligent Koreans early foresaw the course Japanese diplomacy was taking. At the close of the Sino-Japanese war Tokio attempted to pave the way for a protectorate. Blunders, freely acknowledged later, made that step inopportune, but it brought from Prince Pak, the Korean prime minister of the day, this comment: "If Japan establishes a protectorate over Korea, she will eventually absorb or control the country. Japan has guaranteed our independence, and I want to see that independence so maintained."

The close of the Russo-Japanese war found Japan ready to act with energy. Marquis Ito, one of the most brilliant of her older statesmen, was sent as a special envoy to Seoul to obtain the consent of the Emperor of Korea to a pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tectorate. Japanese soldiers already were in complete control of the country, and it was being exploited almost exclusively by Japanese commercial houses. Everything was in their hands except the machinery of government. This it was Marquis Ito's duty to obtain. But the Cabinet was obdurate. The emperor was virtually a prisoner. Ito's soldiers surrounded the palace and held the streets. Early in the morning of November 17, 1905, after three days of the most intense excitement, Ito induced the cabinet to send for the Great Seal, which was affixed to a treaty granting to Japan almost absolute control over every Korean activity. Immediately the people of the empire went into national mourning. They assembled from every direction in the capital, to die, if necessary, before the palace as a protest against the signing away of their independence. Day after day mourning thousands sat in the streets, and many of them literally died of starvation as the only protest they could make against being given over to an alien rule. In announcing the appointment of Marquis Ito as the resident general in Seoul, Japan made every effort to show that there had been no breach of the numerous treaties guaranteeing the integrity of Korea, and insisted that she had only "brought a little pressure to bear on a weaker brother to assist him along the path of progress."

In 1907 Korea managed to get a delegation to The Hague to present a plea for action by the international congress for the restoration of the Government to native hands; but the plea fell on deaf ears. The Japanization of the country proceeded swiftly to a point at which Tokio deemed it possible to take the last step, and on August 22, 1910, the formal decree was issued annexing Korea to the Japanese Empire under the control of a governor-general and under the name Chosen. The process of converting Koreans into Japanese began intensively immediately after annexation, although it had been well developed under the protectorate. Prince Ito, the first governor-general, had hoped to eliminate nationalism gradually by recognizing able Koreans and making them part of the government, and he brought them in large numbers into the administrative and judicial offices. His assassination, however, threw the Government into the hands of Count Terauchi (later premier of Japan) as governor-general. Count Terauchi, very much the Prussian type of officer, immediately subordinated the civil administration to the military, and the history of the country since the day of his appointment has been one of rule by the sword. Gradually the natives placed in office by Ito were removed. Native activities of all kinds were suppressed with an iron hand. Missionaries were discouraged. Five hundred mission schools, under a recent regulation, are prohibited from imparting religious instruction of any kind during school hours and are put under administrative control.

The Tokio Government has freely confessed that, far from opening Korea to world trade, the colony is being held for exploitation by Japanese interests. Foreign capital is not encouraged, and where it has been well entrenched, transport, customs regulations, and tax laws are made so burdensome that there can be no real competition with the Japanese. Baron Kato, one of Japan's ablest statesmen, stands unalterably opposed to this policy, and in a recent speech before the Diet protested energetically against the holding of colonies simply for the enrichment of Japan. He desired his country to regard herself as the steward of her colonial possessions, and to invite, rather than discourage, the introduction of foreign trade and foreign customs, wherever these would prove economically or morally beneficial. The wave of criticism that swept over the empire when his address became public indicated, however, that his protest has very few supporters.

The Japanese wishes the Korean to become thoroughly Japanese in thought and action, but he excludes him from social intercourse, discourages intermarriage, and fails to provide adequate schools. In 1914, according to the Japanese Year Book, there were 291,217 Japanese residents in Korea, for whom were provided 315 schools, attended by 35,000 pupils. In the same year the native population numbered 16,000,000, for whom were provided 487 schools, attended by 67,000 pupils. The figures are eloquent evidence of the Government's desire to improve the mental condition of the native population. Politically and economically there is no question but Korea has greatly benefited by Japanese control. The Government has introduced the most modern sanitary regulations. It has engaged in vast reforestation projects. It has developed important irrigation works, built modern houses, paved streets, and eliminated banditry. But it has done all this for Japan and not for Korea. Whether Koreans are capable of self-government, either independently or as an autonomous state under Japanese sovereignty, is a question that the best and most disinterested friends of the people are not ready to answer affirmatively. There is a marked difference of opinion among missionaries who have devoted years of their lives to labor among the native villages, but the consensus of opinion seems to favor independence. Certainly a high degree of efficiency has been displayed in the organization and direction of the revolution. The control of nationalist feeling, under the most trying conditions, indicates the determined character of the revolt. It probably will be put down, but it will continue for months to come—a period long enough at least to focus the attention of the world on it, and compel Japan, in deference to the opinion which it will generate, to modify the severity of her rule, grant a measure of self-government, and adopt a somewhat more tolerant attitude toward the native desires in regard to language, religion, costume, and manner of thought.

A Correction

OWING to faulty translation, certain errors appear in the English text of the treaty of March 6, 1898, between China and Germany, as published in the *International Relations Section* for September 20. The following *errata* should be noted in referring to the document:

Preamble: Line 6 should read: hitherto been manifested by Germany towards China.

Part I. Article II. Lines 2-4 should read: that Germany, like other Powers, may have a place of its own on the Chinese coast, for the repair and fitting out of ships, etc.

Article II. Lines 8-12 should read: Germany undertakes to carry through to completion within a suitable time upon the territory conceded to it, fortifications for the protection of the projected buildings and establishments and of the entrance to the harbor.

Article III. Section 11 should read: On the southerly side of the entrance of the bay: The tongue of land bounded on the southwest by a line drawn from the most southwesterly point of the inlet situated south-southwestward of Chiposan Island in the direction of Tolosan Island.

Article III. Paragraph II. Lines 1-2 should read: The high contracting parties reserve to themselves a more exact fixation, etc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Article V. Lines 5-6 should read: to concede to Germany a more suitable place. Paragraph IV should read: If parcels of real estate owned by Chinese shall be demanded for any purpose the owners shall be indemnified for them.

Part II: Article I. Section 1. Line 3 should read: the direction of the boundary of Shantung.

Article III. Lines 1-10 should read: For the regulation of the details a special agreement will be drawn up in the near future by the high contracting parties. China and Germany will regulate this matter for themselves; the Chinese Government, however, binds itself to concede to the German-Chinese railroad company (companies) which is (are) to build the railroads, fair terms for the building and operation of the designated railroads, so that in all economic questions it (they) shall not be placed in a worse position than other Chinese-European companies elsewhere in the Chinese Empire. This provision has reference only to economic matters and has absolutely no other meaning.

Part III: Lines 6-7 should read: industrial and commercial firms.

Documents

The British-Persian Treaty

FOLLOWING is the text of the recent agreement between Great Britain and the Persian Government.

No. 1

Agreement between the Governments of Great Britain and Persia

PREAMBLE: In virtue of the close ties of friendship which have existed between the two Governments in the past, and in the conviction that it is in the essential and mutual interests of both in future that these ties should be cemented, and that the progress and prosperity of Persia should be promoted to the utmost, it is hereby agreed between the Persian Government on the one hand, and His Britannic Majesty's Minister, acting on behalf of his Government, on the other, as follows:

1. The British Government reiterate, in the most categorical manner, the undertakings which they have repeatedly given in the past to respect absolutely the independence and integrity of Persia.

2. The British Government will supply, at the cost of the Persian Government, the services of whatever expert advisers may, after consultation between the two Governments, be considered necessary for the several departments of the Persian Administration. These advisers shall be engaged on contracts and endowed with adequate powers, the nature of which shall be the matter of agreement between the Persian Government and the advisers.

3. The British Government will supply, at the cost of the Persian Government, such officers and such munitions and equipment of modern type as may be adjudged necessary by a joint commission of military experts, British and Persian, which shall assemble forthwith for the purpose of estimating the needs of Persia in respect of the formation of a uniform force which the Persian Government proposes to create for the establishment and preservation of order in the country and on its frontiers.

4. For the purpose of financing the reforms indicated in clauses 2 and 3 of this agreement, the British Government offer to provide or arrange a substantial loan for the Persian Government, for which adequate security shall be sought by the two Governments in consultation in the revenues of the customs or other sources of income at the disposal of the Persian Government. Pending the completion of negotiations for such a loan the British Government will supply on account of it such funds as may be necessary for initiating the said reforms.

5. The British Government fully recognizing the urgent need which exists for the improvement of communications in Persia, with a view both to the extension of trade and the prevention of famine, are prepared to coöperate with the Persian Government for the encouragement of Anglo-Persian enterprise in this direction, both by means of railway construction and other forms of transport; subject always to the examination of the problems by experts and to agreement between the two Governments as to the particular projects which may be most necessary, practicable, and profitable.

6. The two Governments agree to the appointment forthwith of a joint committee of experts for the examination and revision of the existing Customs Tariff with a view to its reconstruction on a basis calculated to accord with the legitimate interests of the country and to promote its prosperity.

Signed at Teheran, August 9, 1919.

No. 2

Agreement relating to Loan of 2,000,000l., at 7 per cent., Redeemable in Twenty Years

PREAMBLE: Contract between the British Government and the Persian Government with reference to an agreement concluded this day between the said Governments. It is agreed as follows:

Article 1. The British Government grant a loan of 2,000,000*l.* sterling to the Persian Government, to be paid to the Persian Government as required in such instalments and at such dates as may be indicated by the Persian Government after the British Financial Adviser shall have taken up the duties of his office at Teheran, as provided for in the aforesaid agreement.

Art. 2. The Persian Government undertakes to pay interest monthly at the rate of 7 per cent. per annum upon sums advanced in accordance with article 1 up to 20th March, 1921, and thereafter to pay monthly such amount as will suffice to liquidate the principal sum and interest thereon at 7 per cent. per annum in twenty years.

Art. 3. All the revenues and Customs receipts assigned in virtue of the contract of the 8th May, 1911,* for the repayment of the loan of 1,250,000*l.* are assigned for the repayment of the present loan with continuity of all conditions stipulated in the said contract, and with priority over all debts other than the 1911 loan and subsequent advances made by the British Government. In case of insufficiency of the receipts indicated above the Persian Government undertakes to make good the necessary sums from other resources, and for this purpose the Persian Government hereby assigns to the service of the present loan, and of the other advances above mentioned, in priority and with continuity of conditions stipulated in the aforesaid contract, the Customs receipts of all other regions, in so far as these receipts are or shall be at its disposal.

Art. 4. The Persian Government will have the right of repayment of the present loan at any date out of the proceeds of any British loan which it may contract for.

Signed at Teheran, August 9, 1919.

No. 3

Article 5 of Contract between the Persian Government and the Imperial Bank of Persia relating to the Persian Government 5 per cent. Loan of 1,250,000l. of May 8, 1911.

(Included for reference.)

5. The Imperial Government of Persia specially assigns to the service of the loan, and as a first charge thereon, subject only to prior charges amounting to 15,714*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.* per annum for three years, and 30,278*l.* 12*s.* 7*d.* per annum from the year 1913 to the year 1928, the full net customs receipts of every description which the Government now is, or at any time hereafter may be, entitled to collect and receive at all ports or places in the Persian Gulf, including Bushire, Bunder Abbas, Lingah, Mohammerah, and Ahwaz, which receipts are hereby made payable to the Bank, and the Imperial Government of Persia hereby engages forthwith after receipt thereof to pay to the Bank all such Customs receipts as aforesaid without deduction other than for actual expenses of administration of the customs of the said ports disbursed prior to the date of such payment.

* See No. 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*a.*) The Imperial Government of Persia undertakes that throughout the continuance of the loan all sums collected by the Customs Administration shall be paid to the Bank at the ports of collection, or at its nearest branch, week by week for meeting the prior charges referred to above and for the service of the loan, and an account of such receipts shall be submitted to the Persian Government by the Bank at the end of each month.

(*b.*) The bank shall, out of the moneys so collected, pay the prior charges above mentioned, and the interest and sinking fund of the loan, and shall hold the surplus at the disposal of the Imperial Government of Persia.

(*c.*) The bank undertakes, out of the moneys so received, to pay on behalf of the Imperial Government of Persia the half-yearly coupon in London, and supervise the working of the sinking fund and service of the loan free of charges connected with the same.

(*d.*) In the event of the Customs receipts of the above-mentioned ports for any three months falling short of the amount required for the prior charges and the service of the loan, either for interest or amortisation, the Imperial Government of Persia binds itself to make good such deficiency from other sources of Government revenue, and further, should receipts from these sources fall below the amount required as above, the Persian Government hereby assigns for this purpose the revenue derived from the receipts of the telegraphs—this assignment to constitute a second charge on the said telegraph receipts up to the year 1928, after which the telegraph receipts will be free.

No.4

Sir P. Cox to His Highness Vossug-ed-Dowleh.

British Legation, Teheran, August 9, 1919.

Your Highness,

I trust your Highness has been able, during your successful direction of affairs of the Persian State, to convince yourself that His Britannic Majesty's Government have always endeavored to support to the utmost the efforts of your Highness's Cabinet on the one hand to restore order and security in the interior of the country, and on the other to maintain a policy of close coöperation between the Persian and British Governments.

As further evidence of the goodwill by which the Cabinet of London is inspired, I am now authorized to inform your Highness that, in the event of the agreement regarding projects of reforms which your Government contemplates introducing in Persia being concluded, His Britannic Majesty's Government will be prepared in due course to coöperate with the Persian Government with a view to the realization of the following desiderata:

1. The revision of the treaties actually in force between the two Powers.
2. The claim of Persia to compensation for material damage suffered at the hands of other belligerents.
3. The rectification of the frontier of Persia at the points where it is agreed upon by the parties to be justifiable.

The precise manner, time and means to be chosen for pursuing these aims shall be discussed, as soon as practicable, by the two Governments. I have, etc.,

(*Signed*) P. Z. Cox

No. 5

Sir P. Cox to His Highness Vossug-ed-Dowleh.

British Legation, Teheran, August 9, 1919.

Your Highness,

With reference to the second desideratum indicated in my previous letter of today's date, it is understood and agreed between the two Governments reciprocally that, on the one hand His Majesty's Government will not claim from the Government of His Majesty the Shah the cost of the maintenance of British troops which His Majesty's Government were obliged to send to Persia owing to Persia's want of power to defend her neutrality, and that on the other hand the Persian Government will not claim from the British Government an indemnity for any damage which may have been caused by the said troops during their presence in Persian territory.

It is to be understood, however, that this agreement of the two parties does not in any way affect the claims of individuals and private institutions, which will be dealt with independently.

A note from your Highness informing me that you accept this position on behalf of the Persian Government will suffice to record the agreement of the two Governments on this subject. I have, etc.,

(*Signed*) P. Z. Cox

The Kaiser and the Austrian Ultimatum

THE *Staats-Zeitung* (New York) of August 31 reprinted from *Deutsche Politik* the following letters dealing with the Serbian reply to the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum of 1914, which letters, if genuine, throw interesting light upon the question of responsibility for the war. The first is from the Kaiser to the Imperial Chancellor, von Bethmann-Hollweg; the second, written in pursuance of instructions contained in the first, is from von Plessen, Adjutant-General of the Emperor, to von Moltke, Chief of the General Staff.

New Palace, July 28, 1914.

Your Excellency: Upon perusal of the Serbian reply, which I received this morning, I am convinced that on the whole the wishes of the Danube Monarchy have been complied with. The few reservations which Serbia makes as to particular points could, in my judgment, be clarified by negotiations. But the document involves capitulation and thus removes every cause for war. Nevertheless, it is a scrap of paper to the contents of which is to be imputed only a limited value so long as it has not been carried out. The Serbians are Orientals, hence mendacious, false, and masters in procrastination. In order to convert the[illegible] nice promises into truth and facts, a *douce violence* must be practiced. This could be done in such a way that Austria receives a security (Belgrade) for the enforcement and carrying out of the promises, to be held until all conditions are complied with. This is necessary, too, in order to give to the army, thrice uselessly mobilized, an outward *satisfaction d'honneur*, the semblance of a success in the eyes of the outside world, and the consciousness of having stood on foreign soil. Otherwise there might be bitterness against the dynasty, which would be hazardous.

In case Your Excellency shares my opinion, I would suggest that we say to Austria that Serbia's retreat was forced, and offer congratulations; that there naturally exists no more cause for war, but that a guarantee is necessary for the fulfilment of the promises. This could be achieved by the temporary military occupation of a section of Serbia, just as in 1871 we left troops in France until the billions were paid. On this basis I am willing to negotiate Austria's peace. Contrary propositions and protests of other states I would unconditionally reject, the more so because all of them appeal to me more or less openly to help preserve the peace. This I shall do in my own way and with as much consideration as possible for the national feeling of Austria and the honor of its army. To the latter an appeal has already been made by the Commander-in-Chief, and it is ready to respond to the appeal. Hence it must have a *satisfaction d'honneur*. This is the condition of my mediation. Therefore, your Excellency will cause Plessen, who shares my views, to write accordingly to the Chief of the General Staff.

(*Signed*) WILHELM.

Potsdam, July 28, 1914.

His Majesty, the Emperor and King, directs the following communication to Your Excellency: The reply of the Serbians to the Austrian ultimatum is now here. After perusing the same His Majesty finds that the Serbians have approved practically

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the demands made upon them, and that the cause for war is thereby removed. Sir Edward Grey, being of the same opinion, has asked us to mediate, a request which we could not but comply with, if we did not wish to expose ourselves to the charge of promoting war. In any event, Austria must be given a security as a bond for the fulfilment of the promises made by Serbia. The Emperor himself has written this marginal note on the Serbian answer: "A spendid performance in only forty-eight hours. It is more than one could expect. A great moral victory for you. With this every cause for war vanishes, and Giesl could have quietly remained at Belgrade. Upon the strength of this I should never have ordered mobilization."

Foreign Press

Mr. Brailsford on the Persian Treaty

UNDER the caption, "Our Second Egypt," *The Daily Herald* (London) of August 20 carries the following comment by Mr. H. N. Brailsford on the British-Persian agreement.

Public opinion is often grossly unjust to diplomatists and statesmen, for the simple reason that it is unfamiliar with the technical language which they use. Upright men are constantly accused of lying and hypocrisy, merely because the average citizen does not realize that diplomacy, like every other craft and mystery, has its own terminology, its own specialized use of words.

In the interests of charity, I have several times been on the point of compiling a handy pocket grammar and vocabulary of diplomacy. I thought I knew the European usage fairly well, but the irruption of Mr. Wilson upon our scene threatens to modify our terminology. If one knew the American language accurately (as I do not), one would doubtless be able to perceive that the Treaty of Peace is an exact translation of the Fourteen Points.

One's ignorance of American, however, is no handicap to an understanding of our new Persian Treaty. Much that is unfair has already been written about it. An honester, squarer document in good official English one could not wish to read.

It opens by guaranteeing the independence and integrity of Persia. It goes on to impose British advisers upon her. It next places her army under British officers. It finally takes over her revenues as security for her debts.

If the reader feels puzzled, it is only because he does not realize what is meant by the guarantee or recognition of a weak nation's independence. The phrase has to the inexpert ear a somewhat hypocritical ring. Polite, one may call it, delicate, a phrase with the fragrance of good breeding about it, but surely not dishonest. When one guarantees a weak country's independence, one protects it. To protect it (as my grammar would show) is, of course, very nearly, but not quite, to make it a protectorate. It will be our protectorate when, in due course, other Powers recognize that we protect it, and that will be when we recognize that they in turn protect someone else. "I protect Persia. You protect Syria. He protects Mexico. We are all a League of Nations." So one should conjugate this verb.

But note its subtlety. If I protect Persia, before you have completely protected Syria, while he is still "watchfully waiting" for Mexico, then I am an Imperialist, you are a thief, he is no better than an idealist, and the League of Nations is in danger.

The central fact of this situation is that the disappearance of Imperial Russia has enabled us to act for the first time without the fear of local opposition in Persia. In 1907 we divided it into spheres of influence with Russia. Russia is gone, and to an orphaned Persia we must now endeavor to be father and mother both. Her status is now to a nicety that of Egypt before the war. We alone may appoint the "advisers," who (with all the modesty of an Imperial race) will "assist" Persian Ministers to reorganize their country, while we also will appoint the officers who will command the troops, who will see that our advice is respected.

It is a familiar story, and in this case it is complicated by the usual tragedy of the East.

As in the case of Egypt, so here, we refrained from "protecting," so long as the traditional corruption of Persian despotism seemed hopeless. We have struck down this little nationality only after it began to show some civic courage, some zeal for reform, some passion for democracy, some living patriotism.

As in Egypt, so here, we must now fatally and consistently support and use whatever is reactionary and corrupt in the Persian State. The popular parties, the honest nationalists, the opponents of the Shah and the grandees, the men who had dreamed (and nearly realized their dream) of a restored democratic Persia, will necessarily be against us.

As in Egypt, so here, we shall balance the Budget, restore order, and do much for railway and irrigation, but in Egypt we forgot, till Lord Cromer went, to pass a Factory Act.

The complications in this simple and familiar story come from our neighbors. Mr. Wilson talked idealism, but the Persians, excellent linguists as a rule, do not know American. These simple men had heard that Persia was to be a member of the League of Nations. They naïvely sent representatives to Paris, and imagined that these delegates would be heard. What these delegates went to say is no secret. They wanted expert "advisers," but they proposed that they themselves should appoint them. They wanted officers to organize their police, but again they did not wish to depend on one great neighbour for them. Why should not some one like the American Mr. Shuster restore their finances? Would not Swedes, for example, make good instructors for the police?

In vain they knocked at the doors of Paris. The Big Four would not receive them. Wilson was deaf. Realizing at length that the League of Nations has ears only for the great, the Shah at last signed the Treaty. He could do nothing else. We occupy his country.

The other complication comes from the French. We are not anxious, it seems, to facilitate their acquisition of Syria. We talk Arab nationalism; we are anxious about the frontiers of Jewish Palestine (incidentally a "mandated" State of our own); we think the Syrians should have a say in deciding who protects them. So for the moment the Paris press retorts by bewailing the sad fate of Persia. The woes of Persia will be bearable when they get Syria. Observe with what noble fortitude Japan bears them—but then she has already got Shantung. . . .

A French Point of View

BRITISH policy in Persia has been the subject of widespread comment in the press of France. The following typical example of French opinion is taken from an editorial in *Le Temps* (Paris), of August 17.

. . . It appears that the new Anglo-Persian agreement explicitly preserves the integrity and independence of Persia. These expressions have been used before. The Anglo-Russian arrangement of August 31, 1907, begins in effect with these words: "The Governments of Great Britain and Russia, being mutually pledged to respect the integrity and independence of Persia . . ." This arrangement, we recollect, had as its principal object to carve out of Persian territory an English zone and a Russian zone. If the same words "integrity and independence" now appear in the new Persian agreement, it is evidently difficult to give them another meaning in 1919 than in 1907—the meaning of a simple oratorical precaution.

Moreover, although the contents of the new agreement are imperfectly known in Europe, it may easily be established that they are an attack on the independence of Persia. Since the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Persian Government promises to entrust its army to British officers and its finances to British specialists, it has neither independent power nor independent resources to exercise its sovereignty, to carry out policies of its own choosing. Even without going further, without speaking of the loan secured by the customs, of the economic concessions, or of a diplomatic collaboration between Great Britain and the Persian Government, it is evident that the political independence of Persia after the agreement is not what it was before the agreement.

We read in the Covenant of the League of Nations, in Article 10: "The Members of the League undertake to respect and to preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League." A little further on, in the annex, it is stated that Persia figures among the governments "invited to accede to the Covenant." On the strength of the treaty of Versailles which contains the Covenant of the League of Nations, and which, having been signed on June 28, has been ratified by the British Parliament, "the existing political independence" of Persia ought to be respected. It is not in the slightest degree. . . .

Persia is governed under a Constitution of December 30, 1906, completed October 7, 1907. Article 24 of that Constitution of 1906 is worded as follows:

> The conclusion of treaties and conventions, the granting of concessions, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and otherwise, without distinction among those which apply to its own subjects or foreign subjects, will be subject to the approval of the National Advisory Assembly, with the exception of those treaties which for reasons of state and for the public advantage must be kept secret.

The Anglo-Persian agreement is naturally not in the class of secret treaties, since England has repudiated secret diplomacy. Besides, the Persians have published it at Teheran. It should then be submitted to the Persian Assembly. Until this Assembly has passed it, it is non-existent.

But the Assembly in question has not yet been called together. Regular elections have not taken place, owing to a number of hindrances. Balloting could not go on, nor could the Assembly deliberate as long as present conditions in Persia endure. Neither the nation nor the Government is free. They are in the power of a British military occupation with all the interventions that such a régime permits in the economic and political life of the country. Let us not cite the facts, in order not to impassion the discussion. But if there is any doubt, let an international commission of inquiry be sent to the spot.

Let us suppose that the troops and the British staffs leave Persia in a few months. Then the elections may be held and the Assembly opened. Will it ratify the agreement which has just been concluded? That is not very probable; but supposing that it ratifies, what will happen then? The treaty of Versailles will then be in force, and Persia will sit in the League of Nations. Article 10 of the Covenant will be in force. The abrogation of Persian independence will then be illegal. And the Anglo-Persian agreement will be destroyed by Article 20 of the Covenant of the League of Nations:

> The members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or undertakings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.
>
> In case any member of the League shall, before becoming a member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligation.

All Students of Current History

should have the following authoritative documents:—

The League of Nations ..... 15c.
A Practical Suggestion by Lieut.-Gen. Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, P. C.
Decrees and Constitution of Soviet Russia .. 25c.
Majority and Minority Reports of Coal Industry Commission of Great Britain .... 25c.

Get these at your bookshop, or direct from

The Nation Press, Inc.
20 Vesey Street New York

What We Eat And What Happens To It
By Philip B. Hawk
Post 8vo. Cloth. $1.35
HARPER AND BROTHERS
NEW Est. 1817 YORK

CALIFORNIA DESERT TRAILS
By Enos A. Mills
An unusually attractive book by the author of "Yosemite Trails" and "California Coast Trails." Illus. $3.00 net.
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

MUNDANE A Story of The United States in 1921
As an Industrial Republic with Competition and Co-operation in keen Rivalry for Efficiency and with the Single Tax as the only compulsory feature of moment in the land. The story prepaid Ten Cents. For Sale at
PAUL ELDER & CO., 239 Grant Ave., San Francisco, Cal.

BETTER EYESIGHT
A monthly magazine devoted to the prevention and cure of imperfect sight by treatment without glasses.
W. H. Bates, M.D., Editor.
Published by the
Central Fixation Publishing Company
45 East 42nd Street, New York
Price $2.00 a year Sample copies free

MARX INSTITUTE
A school devoted to the study of Economics, Philosophy, and History. Send for Circular. *Address:*
MARX INSTITUTE
305 West 130th Street, New York City

THRIFT and CONSERVATION
HOW TO TEACH IT. By Arthur H. Chamberlain, Chairman, Thrift Education, N.E.A., and James F. Chamberlain.
This new volume in LIPPINCOTT'S SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL GUIDES, edited by W. F. Russell, A.B., Ph.D., Univ. of Iowa, sets forth the principles of teaching thrift, one of the big problems of reconstruction now in the hands of the teachers of this Nation. Price $1.40.
J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY - Philadelphia

THE MODERN LIBRARY
OF THE WORLD'S BEST BOOKS
72 titles now published.
75c. a volume. Catalogue on request.
BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y.

We need the INDEX for
Vols. 105, 106, 107
of *The Nation*
Address Readers' Service Department
The Nation
20 Vesey Street New York, N. Y.

Students of eighteenth century English literature will find pleasure in Frederic Palmer's essay on Isaac Watts, in the October number of the Harvard Theological Review; besides a critical estimate, it offers a large selection of Watts's poems. The edition is limited, and orders should be sent at once.
Price 50 cents
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
29 Randall Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT
A Tribute by WILLIAM HARD
One of the most beautiful things in prose written, or likely to be written, concerning this great leader, not merely of a party but of all Americans in the living present.
Price $1.50 net postpaid.
Thomas Bird Mosher
PORTLAND, MAINE

BACON vs. SHAKESPEARE
A Brilliant Analysis of the Perennial Paradox "Who Wrote the Plays?"
By GEORGE SEIBEL
Price, cloth, 90 cents; paper, 40 cents, postpaid.
Send card for our list of Books for Thinkers.
THE LESSING COMPANY
Box 383 Pittsburgh, Pa.

NATIONAL NONPARTISAN LEAGUE
Send for bundle of literature telling all about the history, program and achievements of this great Movement.
Price 50 cents
EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT, N.P.L.
Box 495, St. Paul, Minn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED